

# modern

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# language

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 9 1961

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 4, APRIL 1961

# notes

---

- 290 *Beowulf* 2672b: lig *ȳðum* *för*. RUDOLPH WILLARD
- 293 General Prologue 74: Horse or Horses? W. H. FRENCH
- 295 The Date of Middleton's *Women Beware Women*.  
JACKSON I. COPE
- 301 *Sejanus* and Dismemberment. CHRISTOPHER RICKS
- 308 Donne and the Ship Metaphor. D. C. ALLEN
- 312 Donne's Adulterous Female Town. WILLIAM R. MUELLER
- 314 Donne and Dante: The Compass Figure Reinterpreted.  
ROBERT F. FLEISSNER
- 321 The Realms of Being in the Epilogue of *Comus*. JOHN ARTHOS
- 324 Summer, Winter, Spring, and Autumn in *Tom Jones*.  
PETER B. MURRAY
- 326 The Miscegenation Theme in the Works of Thackeray.  
PHILLIPS GEORGE DAVIES
- 331 The Iconographic Sources of Auden's "Musée des Beaux Arts."  
MAX BLUESTONE
- 336 Die Etymologie des Wortes *Kux*. JUDY MENDELS

## REVIEWS

- 341 HENRY M. HOENIGSWALD, *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction* (VLADIMÍR HONSA)
- 346 ALVIN KERNAN, *The Cankered Muse. Satire of the English Renaissance* (KATHLEEN WILLIAMS)
- 348 G. M. STORY and HELEN GARDNER, *The Sonnets of William Alabaster* (LOUIS L. MARTZ)
- 354 F. P. WILSON, *Seventeenth Century Prose: Five Letters* (JOHN M. WALLACE)
- 356 BONAMY DOBRÉE, *English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century 1700-1740* (KATHLEEN WILLIAMS)
- 359 REUBEN ARTHUR BROWER, *Alexander Pope, the Poetry of Allusion* (AUBREY WILLIAMS)
- 365 GEORGE M. RIDENOUR, *The Style of Don Juan* (EDWARD E. BOSTETTER)
- 368 PIERRE CARLET DE CHAMBLAIN DE MARIVAUX, *Le Paysan parvenu*, ed. FRÉDÉRIC DELOFFRE (HARRY KURZ)
- 370 MAURICE REGARD, *Sainte-Beuve* (RENÉ GIRARD)
- 371 MARC BEIGBEDER, *Le Théâtre en France depuis la Libération* (KENNETH S. WHITE)
- 375 JOHN H. R. POLT, *The Writings of Eduardo Mallea* (JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE)
- 377 HERBERT A. FRENZEL, *Brandenburg-preussische Schlosstheater. Spielorte und Spielformen vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (WOLFGANG F. MICHAEL)
- 379 MARGARET E. ATKINSON, *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare. A comparison of three plays with the original* (BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN)
- 381 ERNST FEISE and HARRY STEINHAEUER, eds., *German Literature since Goethe. Part One: The Liberal Age, 1830-1870; Part Two: An Age of Crisis, 1870-1950* (LIESELOTTE KURTH and WILLIAM MCCLAIN)
- 382 ULRICH K. GOLDSMITH, *Stefan George: A Study of his Early Work* (FRANK WOOD)

---

## modern language notes

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER,

*General Editor*

HENRY HORNIK,

*Managing Assistant*

DON CAMERON ALLEN  
CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
NATHAN EDELMAN  
STEFAN EINARSSON  
JOHN FRECCERO  
RENÉ N. GIRARD  
J. LIONEL GOSSMAN  
RICHARD H. GREEN  
ANNA G. HATCHER  
HAROLD JANTZ  
WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN  
J. HILLIS MILLER  
LAWRENCE J. ROSS  
CHARLES S. SINGLETON  
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$8.00 in the United States; \$8.25 in Canada; \$8.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.25. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Second-class postage paid at Baltimore, Maryland.

# modern language notes

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 4, APRIL 1961

---

## Change in Editorial Policy

Beginning with volume LXXVII, in January 1962, *MLN* will publish articles and reviews dealing only with French, German, Italian, and Spanish languages and literatures. No more contributions in English or American studies will be published. Under the new policy longer articles, as well as our traditional "notes," will be accepted.

The journal will appear five times a year. Four of these numbers will be "special" issues: each special issue will be devoted to one of the languages and its literature. The fifth number will be a "general" one: it will contain articles which, though worthy of publication in *MLN*, could not be included in an appropriate special issue. The Editors mean to make the special issues into annuals, or showcases, of the best scholarship that each field has to offer.

Further details of this change, including the new subscription rates, will be announced later in 1961.

## *Beowulf* 2672b: *līg yðum fōr*

Two verses of the *Beowulf*, lines 2672-2673a, long printed in the editions, though with variation in the punctuation, as *līg yðum forborn* / *bord wið rond*, have proved a troublesome passage. Klaeber, in his note on these verses, (3rd., 1936), commented on *rond*, calling attention to an emendation *rond(e)* proposed by Kemble and followed by some editors though rejected by others (Hoops termed it *unberichtigt*). Klaeber himself conservatively retained *rond*, though expressing nervousness concerning it since in Old English poetry a verse of only three syllables is abnormal. In the section of his edition devoted to textual criticism (p. 279), he raised the question whether catalectic measures were to be allowed, citing *bord wið rond* among the 'interesting cases.'

Professor Pope, in examining the rhythms of the *Beowulf*, found himself faced with a handful of metrically deficient verses, among them the *bord wið rond* of the editions. This he remarked had usually been looked on as a 'traditional but incorrect example,' in fact the sole example in the poem, of a trisyllabic hemistich with alliteration on the first stress only.<sup>1</sup> Examination of the manuscript convinced Pope that this particular reading was the work, not of the scribe, but rather of the editors who failed to take seriously the clear evidence of the manuscript. The *Beowulf* scribe, Pope noted, wrote these verses as seven discrete elements, with equal space between them, except that between *for* and *born* the scribe left slightly more space than elsewhere in the passage in question.<sup>2</sup> Pope proposed, without altering a single item of the manuscript, but with simple recognition of the space between these two forms, to take them as separate words, to end line 2672 with *for*, and to begin line 2673 with *born*. The passage as he repointed it reads as follows:

Æfter ðam wordum    wyrn yrre cwōm,  
2670    atol inwitgæst    oðre siðe

<sup>1</sup> John Collins Pope, *The Rhythm of Beowulf* (New Haven, 1942), p. 320.

<sup>2</sup> In his comment on this reading, Pope notes that the space after *for* is greater than any other in this passage. This is true; but the explanation lies in the fact that the scribe faced a physical difficulty. As may readily be observed in the *Zupitza Autotypes* (Early English Text Society lxxvii, 1882), p. 124, folio 197r, line 14, the descender of the *f* of *fionda*, from the line above, ends at precisely the point at which, following his usual pace, the scribe would have begun the down-stroke of the shaft of the *b* of *born*. To avoid collision in interlinear space he began this stroke slightly further to the right, thereby widening the space he would have made between *for* and *born*. This palaeographical explanation does not impair the soundness of Pope's reading and editorial judgment.



fȳrwylmum fāh fionda niosian,  
 lād̥ra manna; ligȳðum fōr.  
 Born bord wið rond, byrne ne meahte  
 geongum gārwigan gēoƿce gefremman,  
 2675 ac se maga geonga under his mæges scyld  
 elne geðode, þā his āgen wæs  
 glēdum forgrunden.

After these words the dragon came in ire,  
 the terrible enemy, a second time,  
 lucent in fiery surges, to seek out his foes,  
 the hostile men; he moved in waves of flame.  
 The shield burned to the boss; the byrnie could not  
 give protection to the young warrior,  
 but the young man behind his kinsman's shield  
 betook him quickly, since his own was  
 reduced to embers.

Pope's happy reading of this passage changes the classification of *for* from a verbal prefix to a finite verb, *fōr*, with the dragon as the subject; it leaves *born* as a simple verb, with *bord* as the subject. *ligȳðum* remains an adverbial modifier of *fōr*. The reconstituted verses are no longer metrical anomalies but form regular measures: *ligȳðum fōr*, E 1; *born bord wið rond*, D 4, (Pope, p. 307).

Professor Pope's reading has been accepted by Holthausen, in his 8th edition, by Klaeber, in the second supplement to his third edition, 1950, by Professor Dobbie, in his *Beowulf and Judith*, 1953, and by Professor Lehmann, *The Alliterations of the Beowulf*, 1958.<sup>3</sup> It is now the standard reading.

I now propose a further alteration of the received standard text and return in another detail to the reading of the manuscript. Professor Pope observed that the scribe wrote verses 2672b-2673a as seven separate units: *lig yðum for born bord wið rond*, with practically equal space between them.<sup>4</sup> I propose to recognize the space provided by the scribe between *lig* and *yðum* and to read as two words what the editors unanimously print as a compound. I punctuate and capitalize anew:

lād̥ra manna. Lig yðum fōr.  
 Born bord wið rond. Byrne ne meahte

<sup>3</sup> W. P. Lehmann and Takemitsu Tabusa, *The Alliterations of the Beowulf* (Austin, Texas, 1958).

<sup>4</sup> Damage to the outer margin of this folio mars the reading of *bord wið*. The space between them, as it was observed in 1787, is reflected in the transcripts for which Thorkelin was responsible: cf. Kemp Malone, *The Thorkelin Transcripts of Beowulf*, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 1 (Copenhagen, 1951), p. 77, line 2, and p. 121, line 14.

the hostile men. Flame advanced in waves.  
The shield burned to the boss. The byrnie could not

It must be admitted that both readings of verse 2672b, *liġyðum fōr*, as two words, and *liġ yðum fōr*, as three, are equally satisfactory, and, in justification of either, familiar and well-attested patterns and formulas are readily adduced. There remain the problem of the subject of the verbs involved and the larger problem of the relationship of these verses to the action of this portion of the poem.

Uncertainty has always existed as to the exact statements of the poet in lines 2669-2677 of the received standard text. While all recognize *wyrm* as the subject of *cwōm* . . . *niosian*, scholars are uncertain as to the subject of the normally intransitive verb, *forborn*, as the earlier standard versions had it, or *born*, as in Pope's revision. Grein, Chambers, van Schaubert, and Wrenn take *bord* to be the subject of *forborn*; Pope and Dobbie take the dragon to be the subject of *fōr*, and *bord* of *born*. Holthausen, 8th edition, while adopting Pope's reading of *fōr* and *born* as separate verbs, and belonging to separate verses, takes the dragon to be the subject of both (Dobbie, p. 254).<sup>5</sup> In this Wrenn concurs, since he translates 'with flames of fire he utterly burnt the shield right up to the boss.'<sup>6</sup> The reading *Liġ yðum fōr*, which I propose, resolves this uncertainty: *Liġ* is the expressed subject of *fōr*; *fōr* is modified adverbially by the dative / instrumental *yðum*: 'Flame advanced in waves,' a simple and expressive statement as to the dragon's offensive as he moves against Wiglaf and Beowulf, breathing forth blasts of fire. *Bord* is, of course, the subject of *born*: 'The shield burned right up to the boss.' Except for punctuation, the macron, and capitalization, which follow modern usage, nothing is added. There is no emendation of the manuscript reading; no textual justification is necessary. The text explains itself clearly.

It is important to view these new readings as they affect the passage as a whole. The moment of action is that of the dragon's second advance on Beowulf. In the first, Beowulf's sword had failed his expectation; he could not kill the dragon with it, and the dragon breathed forth flames over Beowulf. Beowulf's chosen band of warriors had fled in terror. Wiglaf alone remained. With words of loyalty he moves to his lord's aid, encouraging him courageously and briefly. After these words, 2669a, the dragon advanced a second time against

<sup>5</sup> Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, *Beowulf and Judith* (New York, 1953).

<sup>6</sup> C. L. Wrenn, *Beowulf* (London, 1953), p. 223.

his foes, plural now, with the advent of Wiglaf, 2671-2672a. The dragon is flaming, luminous, incandescent, in the waves of fire which he breathes out, 2671a. The flame shot forward in waves, 2672b. Wiglaf's wooden shield burned to the boss, 2673a. His byrnie could afford him no protection, 2673b-2674, and of necessity he moved quickly behind his lord's iron shield, since his own had been reduced to embers, 2676b-2677a.

The passage is one of great power, moving in its simplicity, with a minimum of ornamentation, and but a single metaphor, 2670a. The action is stated in the simplest, briefest manner, in archaic formulas, and in short staccato verses.<sup>7</sup> This is high artistry. The revised readings permit the simplicity and clarity of the poet's composition to be evident, long clouded as it has been through editorial misrepresentation of the scribe's transcript of the poem.<sup>8</sup>

*Līgȳð* is to be deleted from our glossaries and dictionaries as a ghost form. It is indubitably possible, is of a type well-attested, and formulas can be adduced in its support. But it is simply not the reading of our manuscript. The verse *līg ȳðum fōr* changes in metrical classification from type E 1, Pope p. 367, to D 4 (Pope, p. 362).

*The University of Texas*

RUDOLPH WILLARD

## General Prologue 74: Horse or Horses?

His hors were goode but he was nat gay.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Garland Ethel has recently suggested in these pages that in the line above, "he" means one horse, "were" is subjunctive singular, and the sense runs something like this: "Good though his horse might be, it was not gaily trapped out."<sup>2</sup> Of "goode" he remarks only that he has found nothing decisive about the form.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. W. P. Lehmann, *The Development of Germanic Verse Form*, pp. 4 and 32-33, and the fifth fit of *Beowulf*.

<sup>8</sup> It is perhaps not inappropriate to call attention to the pattern of *b*'s, *o*'s, *r*'s, *n*'s, and *d*'s in *Beowulf*, line 2673, and the carry-over of *or* from the *fōr* of verse 2672b.

<sup>1</sup> This and other quotations are from Professor F. N. Robinson's *Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1957).

<sup>2</sup> *MLN*, LXXV (1960), 97.

<sup>3</sup> He makes the same remark about "hise," with complete justice, except that, being a pronoun, it did not follow the inflection of adjectives, and is therefore irrelevant to the discussion.

It has far more importance than that: it determines the number of the entire construction. For to disregard its termination is to support the erroneous belief that Chaucer might at pleasure add or drop final *-e* whenever meter required. Half of this proposition is true — that he could omit *-e* in situations formerly considered to require it.<sup>4</sup> The opposite, however, does not hold true at all; for whatever the preferences of scribes who made the surviving copies,<sup>5</sup> Chaucer's poetical system permitted him to add the vowel to adjectives only in weak positions, the vocative, and the plural (attributive or predicate).<sup>6</sup> To couple "goode" with a singular was impossible.

Unfortunately no exact parallel from Chaucer's writings contains the word itself as a predicate plural. For this there is excellent reason: like most able writers, Chaucer seldom resorted to the vague "They were" when instead he could describe one person or deed in vivid words. The energetic modes of thought which have made his verse so memorable led him away from general and sweeping expressions and toward particularizing singulars and verbs representing action, not a state of being.

When, however, he had the larger situation to deal with, he proceeded thus:<sup>7</sup>

- |    |         |   |
|----|---------|---|
| GP | 557     | His noethirles <i>blake</i> were and wyde                   |
|    | 591     | Ful <i>longe</i> were his legges and ful lene               |
| TC | 3. 352  | That han in wynter <i>dede</i> been and dreye               |
|    | 3. 1248 | Hire sydes <i>longe</i> flesshly smothe and white           |
|    | 4. 779  | [My clothes] Shal <i>blake</i> been in tokenyng herte swete |
| WB | 391     | They were ful <i>glade</i> to excuse hem blyve.             |

A good many other lines fulfil the necessary conditions except that the adjective occurs in rhyme. But although recent discussions have

<sup>4</sup> For instance, CI 1004, For they were *glad* right for the noveltee.

<sup>5</sup> Of course one finds many inorganic *-e*'s; for instance, GP 83, 123, and 260. For an interesting account of this development in the fourteenth century, see E. Talbot Donaldson, "Chaucer's Final *-E*," *PMLA*, LXIII (1948), 1110 ff.

<sup>6</sup> The authorities cited by Professor Ethel, whatever their vagueness about other matters, agree well enough upon this. As a principle, it applies to all but a handful of very common native adjectives, including fair, more, all, and the semi-pronoun some: in the plural, Chaucer used these indifferently with and without *-e*. Of course, French adjectives have no place in this discussion; and native ones like green, dry, and sweet, as ancient *-ja-* stems, had *-e* in the singular as well as in the plural.

<sup>7</sup> To be relevant to this discussion, the adjectives involved must be Germanic monosyllables used in the plural, and not in elision or indecisive rhyme; the manuscripts should agree upon the essentials of the scansion; and final *-e* must be sounded.

left in doubt to what extent *-e* in this position may have become mute,<sup>8</sup> in the examples to follow there seem reasons to suppose it was sounded. All occur in expressions in the "They were" form and with rhyming words clearly dissyllabic in other places.

bright (Pard 774): rhymes syghte (noun), dissyllabic within the line C1 199, TC 2. 628, 669, etc.

sick (TC 3. 1362): rhymes syke (to sigh), monosyllabic only in elision; and like (to enjoy), never monosyllabic. Cf. GP 18, rhyme to seek, nearly always dissyllabic.

small (Fri 1426): rhyme tale, a dissyllable in almost every case.

wise (TC 1. 991): rhyme wyse (way), nearly always dissyllabic.

young (Mep 334): rhyme tonge, always dissyllabic.

To these might be added the testimony of very many plural adjectives occurring in rhyme or in other constructions than those involving "There were"; for instance, those with nouns;<sup>9</sup> these too may serve as evidence that plurals in *-e* were common, and that the lengthened form did not occur haphazard with singulars.

To dismiss "goode," then, as a purely scribal or optional form is to reject the information it brings regarding the construction. It guarantees that "hors" also had the plural form; that therefore "he" is the Knight; and that whatever objections any one may discover to this as proper phrasing, Chaucer evidently did not share them.

Cornell University

W. H. FRENCH

## The Date of Middleton's *Women Beware Women*

The latter half of Ben Jonson's *Hymenaei*, the courtly masque celebrating the nuptials of Essex and Lady Howard in 1606, provided the germinal idea for Thomas Middleton's *Triumphs of Truth*, the city masque culminating the pageantry accompanying the London mayoralty oath taken on October 29, 1613.<sup>1</sup> Middleton elaborates and

<sup>8</sup> For instance, James G. Southworth, "Chaucer's Final *-E*," *PMLA*, LXII (1947), 910 ff.; Joseph C. Develin, *Gummere and the Chaucerian Short -E* (Philadelphia, 1950); E. Talbot Donaldson, p. 1101; and cf. *PMLA*, LXIV (1949), 601 and 609.

<sup>9</sup> See in *Concordance* bad, bare, bright, fresh, full, late.

<sup>1</sup> Celeste Turner, *Anthony Munday, An Elizabethan Man of Letters*. Univ. of California Publ. in English (Berkeley, 1928), II, i, 160; Ben Jonson ed. C. H. Herford and P. and E. Simpson (Oxford, 1925-52), x, 479, 481 makes it evident that the ultimate debt for both poets in respect to the presentation

gives texture to a tableau which Jonson had only animated rather literally from the pages of his mythological handbooks.<sup>2</sup> And precisely the elements of this elaboration constitute materials for a self-borrowing which suggests a much earlier date than that commonly accepted for Middleton's most controlled tragedy, *Women Beware Women*.<sup>3</sup>

of Truth and Opinion is owing to L. Gregorio Giraldi, *De Deis Gentium . . . Historia*; Allan H. Gilbert, *The Symbolic Persons in the Masques of Ben Jonson* (Durham, 1948), pp. 242-3 cites peculiarities of "Truth" borrowed by Jonson (and from him by Middleton) which can be attributed to Ripa's *Iconologia*.

<sup>2</sup> Herford and Simpson's commentary brings together the pertinent results of Donald J. Gordon's essay in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*, VIII (1945), 107-45.

<sup>3</sup> F. G. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama* (London, 1891), II, 97 suggests "provisionally . . . 1613 on account of the devil with one eye and fireworks at his tail in 'the last Triumph' (V, i, 8-9), which seems to allude to Envy and the fireworks in Dekker's *London Triumphant*, the pageant of 1612." Modern historians have tacitly ignored this suggestion, except Samuel Schoenbaum, who finds the date "too early to be satisfactory" (*Middleton's Tragedies* [New York, 1955], p. 236). F. E. Schelling also thought the tragedy was "from its use of the masque to bring about the catastrophe certainly not to be dated much later than 1612 or thereabouts" (*Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1642* [Boston and New York, 1908], I, 586). This was unconvincing, because the Restoration still knew the trick. H. C. Oliphant, *Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists* (New York, 1929), II, 948 went to the opposite extreme. Observing that the source for the sub-plot of *Women Beware Women* had appeared in English translation in 1627, and that the play had "a maturity of style not characteristic" of Middleton's earlier work, he dated the play just before its author's death in 1627. Elizabeth R. Jacobs followed Oliphant's lead in her edition of the tragedy, an unpublished dissertation at The University of Iowa (1941). Meanwhile, R. C. Bald, "The Chronology of Middleton's Plays," *MLR*, xxxii (1937), 33-43 had placed *Women Beware Women* in the canon at a date "probably very shortly before 1622" because it reveals "tragic powers with strong affinities to those displayed in *The Changeling*." He also pointed out that the French original of Mesliers' tale from which Middleton drew his sub-plot had appeared as early as 1610. Baldwin Maxwell, "The Date of Middleton's *Women Beware Women*," *PQ*, xxii (1943), 338-42 brought to bear some external details to support Bald. He suggested that I, ii, 59-61 refers to plans for the Virginia colony perpetrated in 1620/1, as well as observing that the historical Duke Francesco was a young man, and that Middleton's reference to his age as "fifty-five" would constitute a complimentary (!) reference to King James if the play had been written in 1621, his fifty-fifth year. Aside from the dubious taste of identifying James with the seducer, the circularity of the argument seems self-defeating as evidence for a date. However, nothing else has been brought forward, and Schoenbaum found the Bald-Maxwell preference for 1621 a "plausible conjecture" (*Middleton's Tragedies*, p. 236). G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (Oxford, 1941-56), IV, 905-7 admits that the date is "highly speculative," but prefers to join Oliphant, suggesting "1625?-1627." This was possible since the Jacobs dissertation had shown other cases of Virginia colonisation plans involving women than that cited by Maxwell. Richard Hindry Barker, Middleton's most recent biographer, notes this difficulty, and altogether abandons the attempt to place *Women Beware Women* in the canon (*Thomas Middleton* [New York, 1958],



Jonson's Truth and Opinion, indistinguishably attired, emerged from "a Mist made of delicate perfumes." Confronting her counterpart, Truth comments: "I am that TRVTH, thou some illusive spright; / Whom to my likenesse, the black sorceresse *night* / Hath of these drie, and empty fumes created."<sup>4</sup> The allegation is denied by Opinion, and the confrontants agree to settle the question of identity by seeking "truth" in a debate concerning the relative merits of marriage and virginity. Hard-pressed, Opinion turns to force, and the question is ultimately tried by two groups of richly costumed knights who conduct a stylised tournament. It concludes with "a striking light [which] seem'd to fill all the hall," and from which emerges an Angel who explains how Truth, scintillating, "beates back Error, clad in mists."<sup>5</sup> Middleton's masque is a more elaborate narrative allegory concerning the struggle of Truth, her Angel, and Zeal to eradicate Error's threat to London. But its cohesive vehicle of expression is light-dark imagery expanding from the brief Jonsonian introduction of a symbolic mist. The Angel addressing Zeal at the opening of *The Triumphs of Truth* relates:

..... close behind thee  
 Stood Error's minister, that still sought to blind thee  
 And wrap his subtle mists about thy oath,  
 To hide it from the nakedness of Troth,  
 Which is Truth's purest glory; but my light,  
 Still as it shone, expell'd her blackest spite;  
 His mists fled by, yet all I could devise  
 Could hardly keep them from some people's eyes.<sup>6</sup>

At this point, Error enters, coming with "his head rolled in a cloud, over which stands an owl, a mole on one shoulder, a bat on the other, all symbols of blind ignorance and darkness, mists hanging at his eyes." Addressing Envy, his darling, he ironically cries: "A blindness thicker than idolatry / Clove to my eyeballs; now I'm all of light."<sup>7</sup>

pp. 193-4). The single scrap of grounding for all of this speculation was Fleay's discovery of a probable allusion. While it could not, of course, carry much conviction in itself, it dovetails nicely with the evidence from which I argue in the ensuing paper.

<sup>4</sup> Jonson, VII, 232-3.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., VII, 239-40.

<sup>6</sup> *The Works of Thomas Middleton* ed. A. H. Bullen (London, 1885), VII, 240. All Middleton quotations are from this edition.

<sup>7</sup> Bullen, VII, 241.

The emphasis upon blinding mists continues throughout the masque,<sup>8</sup> but this first description of Error is the most interesting particular, inasmuch as it is directly transplanted into the tension-heightened description of her violator spoken by Bianca when she re-enters the stage following her rape by the Duke:

Now bless me from a blasting! I saw that now,  
Fearful for any woman's eye to look on;  
Infectious mists and mildews hang at's eyes,  
The weather of a doomsday dwells upon him. . . .<sup>9</sup>

This passage lends grim irony in retrospect to the gay irresponsibility of Bianca's first view of the Duke, and the naïve wisdom her mother-in-law voices as they watch a procession from the window:

*Bianca.* Did not the Duke look up? Methought he saw us.  
*Mother.* That's every one's conceit that sees a duke;  
If he look steadfastly, he looks straight at them,  
When he, perhaps, good, careful gentleman,  
Never minds any, but the look he casts  
Is at his own intentions, . . . .<sup>10</sup>

Having trapped Bianca, the Duke himself will recall the moment: "You know me, you have seen me; here's a heart / Can witness I have seen thee" (II, ii, 330-1).

The mists have also enveloped the sub-plot, Hippolito commenting upon the plan which will conceal his incestuous love:

This marriage now must of necessity forward;  
It is the only veil wit can devise  
To keep our acts hid from sin-piercing eyes.  
(II, i, 236-8)

And later, outraged at his own lechery as well as at Leantio's, Hippolito shouts: "there's a blind time made for't, / . . . Art, silence,

<sup>8</sup> Cf. ". . . I'll teach thee to cast mists to blind the plain / And simple eye of man" (242); ". . . she chaseth away Error's mist" (245); "What's here? the mist of Error?" (251); "Vanish, infectious fog . . ." (252); "Thick scales of darkness . . . are fell from both mine eyes" (254); "Such a thick and poisonous mist / Which I set Envy's snakes to twist" (255); ". . . once again with rotten darkness shroud . . ." (256); "the mist falls again and hangs over the beauty of the mount, not a person of glory seen" (256), this last being a stage-direction, as is the following: "Error by the way still busy and in action to draw darkness often upon the Mount of Triumph, which by Truth is as often dispersed" (258).

<sup>9</sup> *Women Beware Women*, II, ii, 425-8.

<sup>10</sup> I, iii, 108-13.

closeness, subtlety, and darkness, / Are fit for such a business" (IV, ii, 6-9).<sup>11</sup>

These words remind us that not only does *Women Beware Women* adapt the imagery of dark and terrible mists from *The Triumphs of Truth*, but that Middleton also adapts the function of the images in a particular fashion. In the tragedy, the blind groping in error is imagistic vehicle for the labyrinthine lusts of the plot. In the masque, the theme is Error, but the allegorical vehicle is lust: Envy is personified as Error's paramour, whom he thus addresses:

... let thy will and appetite sway the sword;  
Down with them all now whom thy heart envies,  
.....  
I'll teach thee to cast mists to blind the plain  
And simple eyes of man; .....  
.....  
All shall be carried with such art and wit,  
That what thy lust acts shall be counted fit.<sup>12</sup>

And Truth warns Man to "Give the first fruits of justice to thyself,"

..... though that elf  
Of sin and darkness, still opposing me,  
Counsels thy appetite to master thee.<sup>13</sup>

As the two works echo one another's larger thematic image patterns, they also culminate their actions in a common image. But as one is triumph, the other tragedy, the image inverts its function. Truth is shocked to find London herself in the mist of Error and surrounded by "four Monsters, Error's disciples, on whom hangs part of the mist for their clothing." Truth sonorously asserts: "We did expect to receive welcome here / From no deformed shapes," and immediately waves them away with her fan of stars, closing with a benediction for London: "Vanish, infectious fog, that I may see / This city's grace,

<sup>11</sup> The symbolism of lust blindness is also invoked by Leantio: see IV, i, 93-105.

<sup>12</sup> Bullen, VII, 242.

<sup>13</sup> Bullen, VII, 246. The "fruit" and "appetite" continue the imagery of the feast from Zeal's immediately preceding speech (Bullen, VII, 245), a pattern which is reinvented by "Perfect Love" toward the close of the masque as she describes "this reverend feast, / Where Truth is mistress" (VII, 257-8). We are reminded of the observation that *Women Beware Women* is permeated by food imagery in association with lust to a much more noticeable degree than is *The Changeling* (Muriel C. Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* [Cambridge, 1935], pp. 234-8 and Irving Ribner, "Middleton's *Women Beware Women*: Poetic Imagery and the Moral Vision," *Tulane Studies in English*, x (1959), 19-33).

that takes her light from me."<sup>14</sup> But ironically-named Bianca must make her leap into darkness. Staring in horror at the corpse of her now-beloved seducer, she drinks his poisoned cup off, crying: "But my deformity in spirit's more foul, / A blemish'd face best fits a leprous soul. / What make I here?" (V, i, 245-7).<sup>15</sup>

It is clear that there is a complex parallelism between *The Triumphs of Truth* and *Women Beware Women*, in the thematic use of imagery, in the particular image patterns themselves, and in some striking details of descriptive phrasing within these image patterns. Middleton did not normally develop his imagery with such consistency, nor did these particular images occupy his attention in *The Changeling*, *A Game at Chess* or the comedies. And it is hardly credible that he would have deliberately looked back in order to adapt a minor masque he had composed some ten to fifteen years before undertaking his great tragedy. The only reasonable inference that remains to be drawn from the parallelism is that *Women Beware Women* was written a short time after or before *The Triumphs of Truth*, that it is a play dating from 1613 or 1614. It seems most likely that it followed the masque, since the imagery of *The Triumphs* emerges so naturally from the Jonsonian source. There is no significant external evidence with which to support the usual suggestions placing the tragedy some time between 1621 and Middleton's death in 1627. And the idealistic principle that an author's work matures in some roughly chronological progression is as fallacious as common: one might make Jonson the exhibition case. It is perhaps safer to look for immediate environmental causes when a man transcends his talent, and I can see no cause for surprise that a dramatist of Middleton's quality should have reached both the state of mind and the superlative skill shown in *Women Beware Women* at a time when the London stages were exhibiting *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, *The Atheist's Tragedy*, *The Insatiate Countess* and *The White Devil*.

*The Rice University*

JACKSON I. COPE

<sup>14</sup> Bullen, VII, 251-2.

<sup>15</sup> "Blemished" not only carried its moral and disfigurement connotations in the 17th century, of course, but also described the dimming of the eyesight: cf. *OED* entries spanning 1440-1677.

## Sejanus and Dismemberment

Because Jonson's *Sejanus* is a classical play, the author can depend on the audience's knowing the story. The end of the story is the death of Sejanus, torn limb from limb after he has been beheaded. Jonson's description of the mob is horrifyingly vivid, and his editors censure "the zest with which Jonson writes out (from Juvenal) sanguinary details of the popular vengeance on his body." And again, "As Gibbon remarks, Claudian 'performs the dissection' 'with the savage coolness of an anatomist.' The criticism applies to Jonson's copy."<sup>1</sup>

Miss K. M. Burton<sup>2</sup> disagrees, in a passing reference: "It seems more likely that Jonson used these details quite deliberately for his tragic purpose"—but unfortunately she does not develop her suggestion. The following note points out that in its imagery—the imagery of the parts of the body—the play anticipates and works towards the final scene. For not only is Sejanus dismembered, but the play shows the tragic dislocation of Roman life, the dismemberment of the body politic.

In discussing the imagery, it will obviously not do merely to count the number of times, say, *heads* are mentioned. Yet the more frequent the imagery is, the less do the uses of such words seem to be casual. Phrases which may seem light in impact, or second-hand, receive power from other strong examples. Clearly, there are some trivial uses of the words, and those I have omitted; yet there is still an amazing number of instances where there is relevance to Jonson's tragic purpose. *Faces*<sup>3</sup> are mentioned (in relevant contexts) seventeen times; *eyes*,<sup>4</sup> fifteen; *heads*,<sup>5</sup> twelve; *tongues*,<sup>6</sup> nine; both *ears* and *hearts*,<sup>7</sup> eight; *hands*,<sup>8</sup> seven; *breasts*,<sup>9</sup> five; *bodies*, *brains*, *hair*

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson (1925-52), II, 19; IX, 634.

<sup>2</sup> "Political Tragedies of Chapman and Jonson," *Essays in Criticism*, II (1952), 411n.

<sup>3</sup> I. 7; I. 128; I. 217; I. 251; I. 307; II. 141; II. 462; III. 23; IV. 53; IV. 174; IV. 264; IV. 379; V. 390; V. 436; V. 788; V. 818; V. 862.

<sup>4</sup> II. 443; II. 450; II. 477; III. 63; III. 314; III. 681; IV. 141; IV. 195; IV. 268; IV. 363; IV. 370; V. 169; V. 508; V. 757; V. 819.

<sup>5</sup> I. 254; III. 22; III. 501; IV. 176; V. 32; V. 35; V. 216; V. 741; V. 771; V. 806; V. 811; V. 818.

<sup>6</sup> I. 7; I. 390; II. 477; III. 44; III. 177; V. 38; V. 509; V. 563; V. 812.

<sup>7</sup> *Ears*: I. 389; I. 417; II. 453; III. 681; V. 83; V. 509; V. 511; V. 757. *Hearts*: I. 251; I. 254; II. 83; II. 273; III. 97; IV. 208; V. 38; V. 825.

<sup>8</sup> I. 255; III. 340; IV. 53; V. 453; V. 812; V. 823; V. 885.

<sup>9</sup> I. 9; I. 24; III. 97; IV. 499; V. 863.

and *beards*,<sup>10</sup> all four times; *trunks*, *flesh*, *nostrils*, *necks*, *legs* and *knees*,<sup>11</sup> three times; *lips*, *blood*, *jaws* and *mouths*,<sup>12</sup> twice; and there are mentions of: teeth, sinews, thumbs, nerves, throats, elbow, heels, nose, arm, thigh, feet, fingers, toes, liver and womb.<sup>13</sup>

In its main purpose (to symbolize and anticipate the fate of Sejanus and of the body politic), the imagery is simple. But there is great power in the thorough exploitation of its possibilities, a sustained imagery of a kind unusual for Jonson and coupled with minor strokes of great subtlety. We yield not only to the ruthless repetitions but also to magnificent ironies.

The very first speech of the play presents men as a grotesque collection of limbs and organs; Sabinus and Silius are not flatterers:

We have no shift of faces, no cleft tongues,  
No soft, and glutinous bodies, that can sticke,  
Like snailles, on painted walls; or, on our breasts,  
Creep up, to fall (I. 7-10).

Rome is a world of sycophants, of faces and tongues:

'You may perceive with what officious face . . .'  
'Now their heads doe travaille, now they worke;  
Their faces runne like shittles'—

a world of "charming tongues," of the "mercenarie tongue," of people in "tongue-reach," where there are no "tongues free."<sup>14</sup> It is a nightmare of hypocritical faces, of the plots of Sejanus

(I doe not know  
The heart of his designes; but, sure, their face  
Lookes farther then the present),

and of the cruelty of Tiberius, "Acting his *tragedies* with a *comick* face."<sup>15</sup> And as we learn in the first scene, it is a world of spies,

<sup>10</sup> *Bodies*: I. 8; I. 126; I. 214; II. 142. *Brains*: I. 256; III. 247; V. 678; V. 819. *Hair*: I. 309; II. 273; V. 453; V. 862. *Beards*: IV. 267; V. 38; V. 676; V. 789.

<sup>11</sup> *Trunks*: I. 26; IV. 409; V. 807. *Flesh*: II. 415; V. 785; V. 822. *Nostrils*: III. 248; IV. 266; V. 676. *Necks*: IV. 405; V. 61; V. 197. *Legs*: V. 120; V. 453; V. 699. *Knees*: I. 204; IV. 53; V. 716.

<sup>12</sup> *Lips*: III. 97; V. 789. *Blood*: III. 128; V. 885. *Jaws*: III. 487; IV. 298. *Mouths*: V. 27; V. 155.

<sup>13</sup> I. 308; I. 573; II. 284; III. 129; V. 261; V. 510; V. 675; V. 789; V. 821; V. 823; V. 824; V. 824; V. 824; V. 825; V. 863.

<sup>14</sup> II. 462; III. 22, 3; I. 390; III. 177; V. 509; V. 563.

<sup>15</sup> I. 250-2; IV. 379.



whose close breasts  
Were they rip'd up to light, it would be found  
A poore, and idle sinne, to which their trunkes  
Had not beene made fit organs (I. 24-7).

The opening speech of the play, then, insists on the imagery. But what is its relation to Sejanus, the Sejanus who will be torn apart? One reason for his rise was that "he prostituted his abused body" (I. 214); and when his ambition is suspected (and the "heart of his designes" distinguished from "their face"), Arruntius vows that if there really is a plot,

My sword should cleave him down from head to heart,  
But I would finde it out: and with my hand  
I'd hurle his panting braine about the ayre,  
In mites, as small as *atomi* (I. 254-7).

Later Sejanus is threatened by Drusus, who will

Cracke those sinnewes, which are yet but stretch'd  
With your swolne fortunes rage (I. 573, 4).

But with superb irony Sejanus himself speaks truly:

If this be not revenge, when I have done  
And made it perfect, let *Aegyptian* slaves,  
*Parthians*, and bare-foot *Hebrewes* brand my face,  
And print my body full of iniuries (II. 139-42).

Similarly, the incident when he saves Tiberius from the fall of rock presents Sejanus as if his body had been crushed or broken, in its account of him

With his knees, hands, face,  
Ore-hanging CAESAR (IV. 53, 4).

Such anticipations lend more than usual power to such ironies as his saying "I wish I could divide my selfe unto you," or his contempt for those

unto whom (within this houre)  
I would not have vouchsaf'd a quarter-looke,  
Or piece of face.

There is force even in Tiberius's affectionate name for him, "Dearest head."<sup>10</sup> So when Sejanus falls, Macro (the new tyrant) threatens to

<sup>10</sup> V. 282; V. 388-90; III. 501.

Kicke up thy heeles in ayre, teare off thy robe,  
Play with thy beard, and nostrills . . .  
tread his braines  
Into the earth      (V. 675-9).

The fate of Sejanus had been augured in the episode of the statue from which smoke issued :

"Let the head be taken off . . ."

"The head, my lord, already is tane off."

For at the news that a serpent leapt from it, Sejanus had mocked dissectingly:

Had it a beard? and hornes? no heart? a tongue  
Forked as flatterie? <sup>17</sup>

The omen of the statue was answered by the first vengeance taken by the mob, who smash his statues:

As as his statues now were sensive growne  
Of their wild furie . . .  
                this, this was that rich head . . .  
The great SEIANUS crack, and piece, by piece,  
Drop i' the founders pit         (V. 768-76).

And there follows a sardonic anticipation of his death, in the ignorant questions of the mob who enquire

what man he was? what kind of face?  
What beard he had? what nose? what lips? (V.788,9).

The inevitable end is enacted, and the mob itself is presented as a gigantic dismemberment,

A thousand heads,  
A thousand hands, ten thousand tongues, and voyces (V. 811, 2).

The power of the description is even more overwhelming when it draws together all that has preceded it:

These mounting at his head, these at his face,  
These digging out his eyes, those with his brain,  
Sprinkling themselves, their houses, and their friends:  
Others are met, have ravish'd thence an arme,  
And deale small pieces of the flesh for favours;  
These with a thigh; this hath cut off his hands;

<sup>17</sup> V. 32, 5; V. 38, 9.

And this his feet; these fingers, and these toes;  
That hath his liver; he his heart: there wants  
Nothing but roome for wrath, and place for hatred! (V. 818-26)

Yet the imagery of separate limbs and organs is not limited to Sejanus, because he is not the only evil dislocation of Rome. It is a world of spies:

"Twere best rip forth their tongues, seare out their eies,  
When next they come."

.. "A fit reward for spies" (II. 477, 8).

"Envies," like "eyes," are watching; spies have "murdering eyes"; and of the eyes of night, "some are spies."<sup>18</sup> So there is grotesque terror in the cry

Were all TIBERIUS body stuck with eyes . . . ,

or in the picture of "our night-ey'd TIBERIUS," setting Macro to spy on Sejanus,

worthiest MACRO,  
To be our eye, and eare.

For the cry about Tiberius's eyes is followed by an equivalent for Sejanus:

Yea, had SEIANUS both his eares as long  
As to my in-most closet. . . .<sup>19</sup>

Through the imagery, Jonson intensifies his macabre lists: "With sacrifice of knees, of crookes, and cringe" (I. 204); or "To give me empire, temples, or their throtes" (V. 261). Similarly, there is new life in what might otherwise be casual phrases: Sejanus as "the second face of the whole world"; "Yea, all the armie have their eyes on him"; "Tells him what hearts he weares"; "Let all the traytors titles be defac'd."<sup>20</sup> Even the gods inhabit the same world:

heartning IOVE  
Had, from his hundred statues, bid us strike,  
And at the stroke clict all his marble thumb's (II. 282-4).

For Sejanus baits Jove as he is to be baited; and can Jove sleep

While vice doth make an antique face  
At thy drad power, and blow dust, and smoke

<sup>18</sup> II. 443; IV. 141; V. 169, 70.

<sup>19</sup> II. 450; IV. 363; III. 680, 1; II. 453, 4.

<sup>20</sup> I. 217; IV. 195; IV. 208; V. 697.

Into thy nostrils? IOVE, will nothing wake thee?  
Must vile SEIANUS pull thee by the beard,  
Ere thou wilt open thy black-lidded eye,  
And looke him dead? (IV. 264-9).

For Sejanus was a petty god, "that had mens knees as frequent, as the gods" (V. 716).

It is the force which Jonson develops in the imagery that is one reason for such a scene as that of the lady and her cosmetics. Sejanus knows that taking off make-up is a kind of dismemberment:

Which lady sleepes with her owne face, a nights?  
Which puts her teeth off, with her clothes, in court?  
Or, which her hayre? which her complexion?  
And, in which boxe she puts it? (I. 307-10).

Indeed, the Physician tells Livia that her decision to murder her husband Drusus has helped her beauty:

This change came timely, lady, for your health;  
And the restoring your complexion (II. 132, 3).

Again, it is the praise of the lamented Germanicus, the last true Roman, that he was

of a body as fair  
As was his mind; and no lesse reverend  
In face, then fame (I. 126-8).

But Rome is doomed,

*Rome*, whose bloud,  
Whose nerves, whose life, whose very frame relyes  
On CAESAR's strength —

for the Caesar is Tiberius with his "wolves iawes" ("Sir, wolves do change their haire, but not their harts"), and his subjects are

The *Roman* race most wretched, that should live  
Betweene so slow iawes, and so long a bruising.<sup>21</sup>

The characterisation of Tiberius, with his insane lusts and cruelties, is built upon the same imagery. Tiberius is the cunning ruler:

We must make up our eares, 'gainst these assaults  
Of charming tongues —

<sup>21</sup> III. 128-30; IV. 298; II. 273; III. 486, 7.

but he is also the pervert,

As (dead to vertue) he permits himselfe  
Be carried like a pitcher, by the eares,  
To every act of vice.<sup>22</sup>

His hypocrisy is seen as physical:

The space, the space  
Betweene the brest, and lips—TIBERIUS heart  
Lyes a thought farder, then another mans (III.96-8).

And his lustful irresponsibility allows Sejanus full power (the lines are among Jonson's greatest), as Sejanus

gives CAESAR leave  
To hide his ulcerous, and anointed face,  
With his bald crowne at *Rhodes*, while he here stalkes  
Upon the heads of *Romanes*.<sup>23</sup>

For it is Tiberius who has promoted Sejanus—

Whom he (upon our low, and suffering necks)  
Hath rais'd —

the Sejanus whose body it seems even the gods will not destroy:

Which IOVE beholds, and yet will sooner rive  
A senseless oke with thunder, then his trunk (IV.405, 408-9).

The power of the imagery informs such details of the play as Arruntius's mention of his "flesh torne by the publique hooke"; or the suicide of Silius, who sums up his scepticism by saying that "I want braine, / Or nostrill to perswade me" and who is praised by Arruntius as "an honorable hand."<sup>24</sup> The insanity of the Senate, where Sejanus is surrounded by sycophants, is grimly premonitory:

Looke, looke! is not he blest  
That gets a seate in eye-reach of him? more  
That comes in eare, or tongue-reach? o, but most,  
Can claw his subtle elbow, or with a buzze  
Fly-blow his eares (V.507-11).

For Sejanus is soon to be near a different crowd, too savagely within ear-reach, eye-reach and tongue-reach of him, to "claw" him and leave him flyblown. But even after the death of Sejanus, the imagery

<sup>22</sup> I. 389, 90; I. 416-8.

<sup>23</sup> IV. 173-6. Cp. 'the publique head,' V. 741.

<sup>24</sup> II. 415, 6; III. 247, 8; III. 340.

survives, in the picture of his wife mourning the murder of her children,

Tearing her haire, defacing of her face,  
Beating her brests, and wombe (V. 862,3).

For in the political and social disintegration of Rome there is no real hope; it is only the caprice of the mob which changes,

And some, whose hands yet reeke with his warme bloud,  
And gripe the part which they did teare of him,  
Wish him collected, and created new (V. 885-7).

For it is part of the tragedy that there is a "new fellow" (V. 751), Macro—a new tyrant. As the imagery insists throughout the play, it is not only Sejanus who in life and death is dismembered, but Tiberius too, and Rome itself.

Worcester College, Oxford

CHRISTOPHER RICKS

## Donne and the Ship Metaphor

Talking to his congregation in 1627, John Donne reminded them that "no metaphor, no comparison is too high, none too low, too trivial to imprint in you a sense of God's everlasting goodnesse toward you."<sup>1</sup> This counsel is one that he himself ardently followed in poetry and prose; for he not only searched the Scriptures and the palatable Fathers for metaphors of a high order, but garnered from the pagans figures that proclaimed the power of human and divine love. For Donne the *mundus symbolicus* of the Middle Ages still existed, and he was so confident of its reality that he furthered its creation, adding to the analogies granted him by Christian antiquity others drawn from the sciences and arts of his own age. Yet even when he made a poetical point with a traditional comparison, he was likely to renew the value of the old equivalent by a symbolic reshaping, by a teasing obscurity, or by an unusual combination of traditional concepts. By tracing the history of the ship metaphor and its moral value, we may observe how he proceeded.

The image of a ship caught in a storm and struggling to make harbor was to the fathers of poetry a superb way of expressing the

<sup>1</sup> *The Sermons*, ed. Simpson and Potter (Berkeley, California, 1953-), VII, 369.



life course of a hero or the political fate of a state. The metaphor is found with the first meaning in Aeschylus<sup>2</sup> and with the second in Sophocles, who speaks of "the shipwreck of state"<sup>3</sup> and the "well-steered ship of state."<sup>4</sup> The second figure of the ship of state was established in Italy by Cicero and is well-known to us through Horace's "O navis referent in mare te novi / fluctus."<sup>5</sup> On the opposite shore from Horace, St. Augustine saw the great middle sea as the World where good rowers are required.<sup>6</sup> The fact that sweet water flows into the brine gives him in one instance a metaphor for the life of Nature and of Grace;<sup>7</sup> but his master image equates the sea with the life of men, and on this sea the salvation ship of Christ or the Church sails.<sup>8</sup>

The sea and ship of St. Augustine, hallowed by hundreds of years of Christian approval, are not unknown to Donne. In "The Progresse of the Soule" he expands the notion beyond its normal patristic scope.

But if my dayes be long, and good enough,  
In vaine this sea shall enlarge, or enrough  
It selfe; for I will through the wave and fome,  
And shall, in sad lone wayes a lively spright,  
Make my darke heavy Poem light, and light.  
For though through many streights, and lands I roame,  
I launch at paradise, and I saile towards home;  
The course I there began, shall here be staid,  
Sailes hoised there, stroke here, and anchors laid  
In Thames, which were at Tigrays and Euphrates waide (51-60).

The same figure combined with the traditional salvation symbol of Noah's Ark comes forward in a somewhat clandestine fashion in "A Hymne to Christ."

In what torne ship soever I embarke  
That ship shall be my embleme of thy Arke;  
What sea soever swallow mee, that flood  
Shall be to mee an embleme of thy blood (1-4).

When we turn from Donne's verse to his pulpit prose, we find

<sup>2</sup> *Suppliants*, 470-1; *Persae*, 433, 598; *Prometheus*, 184.

<sup>3</sup> *Oedipus Rex*, 101; the Aeschylean metaphor appears in the same play (1527).

<sup>4</sup> *Antigone*, 994.

<sup>5</sup> *Carmina*, I, 14: see Plato, *Republic*, VI, 488; Theognis, 671, Alcaeus, frag., 18.

<sup>6</sup> *De Beata Vita*, PL, XXXII, 959; *In Ps. XXIII*, PL, XXXVI, 183, 1223.

<sup>7</sup> *In Ps. LXV*, PL, XXXVI, 794.

<sup>8</sup> *Sermones*, PL, XXXVIII, 474-9; *Ps. XXX*, PL, XXXVI, 439-40; *Ps. CIII*, PL, XXXVII, 1380-1, 1572; *Ps. LIV*, PL, XXXVI, 780-2; *Ps. CXXXVIII*, PL, XXXVII, 1762; *Sermones*, PL, XXXVIII, 1159, 1172-4.

Augustine's ship in Augustine's sea with some metaphoric alterations that are probably invented.

In a sermon preached in 1619 on Matthew 4: 18-20 there is a long symbolic expansion of the *Mundus Mare* and *Status navigantium* (II, 306-7),<sup>9</sup> but the theme of man's spiritual navigation of the symbolic sea appears in many other sermons. We are told that God's justice is our anchor (I, 275), and that Christ's blood is the resin for our keel (VIII, 206). Baptism preserves us from shipwreck (VIII, 211), but we must caulk the leaks of sin (IX, 267). We should also have discretion for ballast and zeal for cargo (VI, 361-2), or "let humility be thy ballast, and necessary knowledge thy freight" (III, 240). If we would steer by chart, we can read Psalm 32: 8 (IX, 115); however, Genesis 1: 26 likewise gives us the "whole Compasse of mans voyage, from his lanching forth in this world, to his Anchoring in the next; from his hoysing sayle here, to his striking sayle there" (IX, 68). For our North Star we should choose a learned and not curious preacher (IV, 209); but, actually, our haven is not beyond our sail, for "though this world be a sea, yet (which is most strange) our Harbour is larger than the sea; Heaven infinitely larger than this world" (VI, 76).

While Cicero and Horace were inventing the ship of state, and Augustine was timbering that of the Church, another ship was testing its rudder against the sea of love. A poet of the *Anthology* describes the wreck endured by the daughters of Diomedes and urges a friend to "fly the pirates of Aphrodite, both you and your boat, for they are more horrid than the sirens" (V, 161). A companion, writing in the same book, says that his soul is drowning in the "Cyprian wave" and asks his beloved to save him from "land shipwreck" by taking him to her port (V, 235). The same image appears in Catullus, "shipwrecked and cast into the sea's wild waves" (LXVIII, 3-4), whereas Propertius, always a bad sailor, finally sails into love's haven: "nunc ad te, mea lux, veniet mea navis / servata" (II, xiv, 29-30). In the *Art of Love* Ovid's lover represents himself as sailing far from the long-sought port (II, 10), and so a whole series of amorous seamen are given a pattern of complaint. The *Remedies* are filled with so much erotic navigation that the poet can finally say to the reader "and now your ship is full of girls. *Plena puellarum jam tibi navis est.*"<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> All references in this section are to the Simpson-Potter edition.

<sup>10</sup> XIV, 70: see Plautus, *Menaechmi*, II, iii, 55; *Miles*, III, iii, 47; *Rudens*, II, iii, 24 and Macrobius, II *Sat.*, V, 9-10.

Ovid's boat of love, ploughing through the rough weather, was overtaken by the troubadours. Guilhem Montanhagol describes it in his "Sicome i marinar guida la stella, / Che per lei ciascun prende suo viagio"<sup>11</sup> and Cadenet follows the same image in "Plus que la naus q'es en la mar prionda / Non had poder de far son dreg viatge."<sup>12</sup> Sordello tells his sea story in a similar fashion:

E pos guid'al ferm l'estela lusenz  
 Las naus qi van perillan per la mar,  
 Ben degra mi cil qil sembla gidar,  
 Q'en la mar sui per leis perfondamentz  
 Tan esvaratz, destreitz e esvaitz,  
 Qei serai mortz, anz qe n'eisca, e fenitz,  
 Si non secor, car non trueb a l'isida  
 Riba, ni port, gat, ni pont, ni garida.<sup>13</sup>

The figure, as everyone knows, was brought plainly before the poets of Europe when Petrarch gathered together most of the possible changes in "Passa la nave mia colma d'oblio,"<sup>14</sup> a sonnet that both Wyatt and Spenser rephrased in English.

The ship of love accounts, I think, for the little boat in which the charming Phaedria sails the Idle Lake, but Spenser must have watched it in other poets of Italy and France who followed the now ancient image. Tomitano describes the mariner-lover as hopelessly lost in "Tal io ch'in questo mar di cieco errore / Lasso fui scorto in fragile speranza / Sotto vento di sdegni e di sospiri."<sup>15</sup> Bembo watches the boat coasting through calm weather and suddenly smitten by storm in "Si come quando il ciel nube non ave,"<sup>16</sup> whereas Ariosto tells of the storm, of the sea drenched horizon, the cold rain, and then—"I saw your eyes and heard your voice on the other shore."<sup>17</sup> The metaphor of love's boat in rough weather or finally making calm haven is developed by Ronsard,<sup>18</sup> Jodelle,<sup>19</sup> Jamyn,<sup>20</sup> D'Aubigne,<sup>21</sup> Shakespeare,<sup>22</sup> Lodge,<sup>23</sup> and Carew.<sup>24</sup> It was torn of sail

<sup>11</sup> J. Coulet, *Le Troubadour Guilhem Montanhagol* (Toulouse, 1898), p. 311.

<sup>12</sup> C. Appel, *Der Troubadour Cadenet* (Halle, 1920), pp. 32-3.

<sup>13</sup> *Vita e Poesie*, ed., De Lollis (Halle, 1896), p. 178.

<sup>14</sup> *Opere*, ed. Mestica (Florence, 1896), pp. 268-9.

<sup>15</sup> *Rime Diverse di Molti . . . Autori*, ed. Gioliti (Venice, 1549), I, 280.

<sup>16</sup> *Gli Asolani*, ed. Dionistotto-Casalone (Turin, 1932), p. 181.

<sup>17</sup> *Lirica*, ed. Fatini (Bari, 1924), p. 37.

<sup>18</sup> *Oeuvres*, ed. Vaganay (Paris, 1924), I, 70; II, 216-7.

<sup>19</sup> *Oeuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux (Paris, 1868-70), II, 16.

<sup>20</sup> *Oeuvres*, ed. Brunet (Paris, 1878), I, 107.

<sup>21</sup> *Oeuvres*, ed. Réaume (Paris, 1873-93), III, 16.

<sup>22</sup> *I Henry VI*, V, v, 3-9. The theme on a lower level may be observed when

and encrusted, with sea things by the time that Donne boarded it; hence, he does not make it the poetic central theme as his predecessors did.

The ship of love appears for a moment in Donne's "Aire and Angels" to make clear, I think, the troubling conclusion of that poem by voting for male purity.

Whilst thus to ballast love, I thought,  
And so more steadily to have gone,  
With wares which would sink admiration,  
I saw I had love's pinnace over-fraught (15-18).

The boat is here but it only sails a short course, and it is a pinnace, too, with the full Falstaffian connotation of that word. It is the same boat that appears in the Eighteenth Elegie where it is combined with the Homeric analogue that the beloved is the whole world and the Paracelsian image of the human body as a map. This time the boat scuds from the forest of the girl's hair through pleasant and dangerous areas, and we need neither Psalm 32:8 nor Genesis 1:26 to plot the journey. The ship of love which had served so many pilots in so many noble oceans is thus finally stranded on the sands of wit.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

D. C. ALLEN

## Donne's Adulterous Female Town

An appreciation of Donne's sonnet "Batter my heart, three person'd God" depends even more than his other religious poems on an understanding of Biblical imagery.

The speaker, beseeching the triune God to woo him more violently, first invokes the battering of his heart. By "heart" he means not simply the machine which acts as a life-saving blood pump or the seat of tender or willful emotions, but rather, in accordance with customary Biblical usage, the whole inner life or character of the human being.<sup>1</sup> Thus Deuteronomy asserts that "the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart . . . to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart . . ."

Mercutio hails the nurse with "A sail! A sail!" (II, iv, 98) or Dalila comes "sailing / Like a stately Ship" (*S. A.*, 713-4).

<sup>23</sup> *The Phoenix Nest*, ed. Rollins (Boston, 1931), pp. 52, 78.

<sup>24</sup> *The Poems*, ed. Dunlap (Oxford, 1949), pp. 23-24.

<sup>1</sup> See H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, Edinburgh, Third Edition, 1952, pp. 22-23, 105-106.

(30:6),<sup>2</sup> and Paul that "circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter . . ." (Romans 2:29). And in one of his sermons Donne writes that "when God had made man, he had made his bed, the heart of man, to rest in. God asks nothing of man, but his heart . . ." (IV, 108).<sup>3</sup> We learn from the sonnet that God has until now but negligently knocked at the door of the petitioner's heart; the speaker would have him break the door down. The Holy Ghost has but breathed in a casual, desultory, directionless way, rather than forcefully blown his life-giving inspiration into the speaker; He has distantly shone, but not yet burned His rays into the heart. The Trinity has merely sought to mend the damaged heart but has not yet fashioned a new life, a new being.

The two central images of the sonnet are those of war and of marriage. The two are related, as the victor at war will also be the victor at marriage; at stake is the heart or the speaker himself. The key to the meaning of the imagery is the Bible; Mars has nothing to do with this battle and Venus nothing to do with this love.

The speaker likens himself to a town rightfully usurped by a power to which it is due. Donne here follows the prophetic practice of underscoring the infidelity, and consequent demonic ravishment, of a community rather than simply of an individual. To Isaiah, "the daughter of Zion . . . is left as a besieged city" (1:8). And the usurpation, with its banishment of Yahweh, has taken place because of idolatry, the breaking of the covenant by Jerusalem: "How is the faithful city becomes an harlot! it was full of judgment; righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers" (Isaiah 1:21).

The most striking aspect of the sonnet is, of course, the marriage or love imagery. The speaker, in spite of his professed love for God, has plighted his troth to the Adversary; he is like Israel which, as the Old Testament frequently says, went a whoring after false gods. The equation of idolatry, of unfaithfulness to God, with either fornication or adultery is one of the more repeated images of the prophetic writers. Jeremiah furnishes one of many examples: "Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the Lord" (3:20).

It is against this Old Testament background that we may best read Donne's comparison of himself (the poet may, I think, be identified

<sup>2</sup> All Bible quotations are from the King James translation.

<sup>3</sup> All sermon quotations are from *The Sermons of John Donne*, edd. George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953. In each case the volume and page number(s) are given.

with the speaker in this sonnet) with an adulterous female town.<sup>4</sup> The most sustained literary example of such an analogy is found, of course, in the Book of Hosea, "the first Israelite prophet to interpret the covenant by comparing it with marriage."<sup>5</sup> Hosea's wife, Gomer, had been unfaithful to him, left him, and sold herself into prostitution. Some years later he found her in poor and wretched condition in the slave market. Discovering, surprisingly enough, that he still loved her, he forgave her, redeemed her from bondage, and restored her freedom. It was revealed to Hosea that his relationship to his wife was like Yahweh's relationship to Israel: both Gomer and Israel had been unfaithful and sold themselves into slavery; but as Hosea forgave freely, so, he reasoned, does God forgive freely. Hosea's wife, then, is to Hosea as Israel is to Yahweh and as Donne is to the Trinity. Donne at the writing of the sonnet is as firmly knit to the Adversary as was Israel in her days of defection; and just as the prophets of Israel called their people to an account of their sins and called upon God for atonement, so does Donne make clear his own lost position and pray for the kind of reconciliation that will lead to freedom.

Donne's sermons are rich in similar imagery. We might read his penitent sonnet also in light of his remark that "Repentance, is an everlasting Divorce from our beloved sin, and an everlasting Marriage and super-induction of our ever-living God" (VII, 163). We might note also Donne's assertion that

God expresses all kind of wickednesse, carnall and spirituall, in that name of *Adultery*, throughout the body of the Scriptures. . . . In the covenant of God you were betrothed, and affianced for that marriage; In the Sacrament of Baptisme you were actually, personally married; and in the other Sacrament there is a consummation of that marriage; And every departing from that contract which you made with God at your Baptisme, and renewed at your receiving the other Sacrament, is an *Adultery*. (IX, 398-399)

Donne's comparison of himself with an adulterous female town is a part of his Biblical heritage. He, like Israel, had broken the covenant and betrayed God's love. His sonnet pleads for a renewal of the saving covenant through which, paradoxically, man's freedom lies in his bondage to God, his chastity in his ravishment by God.

Goucher College

WILLIAM R. MUELLER

<sup>4</sup> The Bible is not alone in assigning the feminine gender to communities. The Renaissance habitually attributed femininity to states, masculinity to rulers. Typical is the line from "The Sunne Rising": "She is all States, and all Princes, I."

<sup>5</sup> Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1957, p. 243.



## Donne and Dante: The Compass Figure Reinterpreted

Scholars have long sought the origin of Donne's "compass figure" by imposing upon a diversified group of unrelated spirits—from Omar Khayyam to Guarini, the Belgian printer Christopher Platin, and the anonymous author of another compass poem in a seventeenth-century commonplace book. No absolute source has been agreed upon. I hereby propose a final solution to the vexing problem: that the poem reflects the medieval tradition which Donne inherited, that its imagery, in being comparable to and possibly influenced directly by Dante's, is indeed "metaphysical"—but more in Scholastic terms than for the sake of ingenuity. It is also "physical"—though more in an Aristotelian than a Freudian sense (see Dante's reference to Aristotle's *Physics* cited at the end of this essay). After briefly examining the meaning of literary influence in this context, I shall indicate how, during the turn of the seventeenth century, the influence of Dante upon Donne may well have been such that the poetic description of the perfect circle in "A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning" can be regarded as exhibiting a reconciliation with

a man pert enough to bee beloved & to much to bee beleeved.<sup>1</sup>

W. A. Murray remarks, in his recent interpretation of Donne's poem, that

more often than has usually been appreciated by his critics Donne's conceits turn out to be connected by complex associations, which, when we discover them, give his poetry a greater degree of coherence.<sup>2</sup>

Such a suggestion leads to a demanding question: What is the criterion for determining what constitutes the most *significant* associations? A correct answer should entail a consideration of those factors which relate most pertinently to the basic characteristics of Donne's age. It is not sufficient to maintain that "complex associations" may be drawn upon to determine the poet's intentions; a distinction needs to be made between two kinds of associational patterns delineating what is historically essential rather than merely essentially historical. The first kind should be treated as representing a higher level than

<sup>1</sup> From a letter of Donne's probably to Wotton quoted by Evelyn M. Simpson in *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1948), pp. 313-314.

<sup>2</sup> "Donne's Gold-Leaf and his Compasses," *MLN*, LXXIII (1958), 329.

the second inasmuch as the literary historian is obliged to select an attitude towards the integrity of the poem in which the image occurs, one which conforms to what best typifies the milieu of which it is a part and to which its own uniqueness contributes. Now among the variety of possible influences upon Donne's figure which have been suggested, not one, to my knowledge, has dealt with what could well be a primary source: Dante's interest in the symbol of the circle as evident throughout his writings (particularly in *Il Convito*). A cardinal reason for this is that until very recently the problem of whether there could have been any appreciable effect of the Italian master upon Donne (or upon his age) has met with almost universally negative response. The two outstanding works on the subject (P. Toynbee's *Dante in English Literature from Chaucer to Cary* and Werner P. Friederich's *Dante's Fame Abroad: 1350-1850*) reveal considerable hesitancy with respect to the possibility of influence. Toynbee writes that although Donne "was undoubtedly acquainted with Italian, and presumably with Dante's great poem, there are but two references to Dante in the whole of Donne's published works" (in *Satire IV*. 157-159, and a *Catalogus Librorum Aulicorum* known in translation as *The Courtier's Library*).<sup>3</sup> However, Evelyn M. Simpson, in her second edition of Donne's prose works, shows the inadequacy of Toynbee's citations by comparing sections of both Donne's *Ignatius his Conclave* and *The Courtier's Library* to the *Inferno* (III. 127-130 and V. 121-123, respectively) and noting that a copy of *L'Amoroso Convivio* found its place in his personal library. "Donne," she says

had travelled in France, Spain, and Italy and knew something of the language and literature of all these countries. He was one of the few Jacobean writers who read Dante in the original.<sup>4</sup>

There is first the possibility that Donne was familiar with *La Vita Nuova*<sup>5</sup> as well as *Il Convito* and *La Divina Commedia*, for it is con-

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. (London, 1909), p. 101.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., pp. 45-46.

<sup>5</sup> Professor Friederich remarks that "the implication that Shakespeare's *Sonnets* could be compared to the *Vita Nuova* — indeed, that perhaps this latter booklet itself was known in Elizabethan England — is strongly rejected by Koeppel, who asserts that the delicate poems by Dante (which surely would have been hailed and imitated by the Elizabethans) were unknown in sixteenth century England and that Petrarca alone supplied the lyricists with their *concetti*." Op. cit. (Rome, 1950), pp. 196-197. Yet he does indicate at another point that Gabriel Harvey may have made the "first reference in English literature to Dante's famed lady-love" (Beatrice — more real in *La Vita Nuova* than symbolic) in 1577 (p. 193) and that Sidney's allusion in the *Apologie for Poetrie* (published in 1595) constitutes the first "definite"

ceivable that Dante's picture of Love occupying the very center of a circle had an influence upon Donne's compass figure. This relationship is an especially appealing one to consider since it takes into account the more aesthetic aspects of Donne's image. Surely the circle transcribed by the compasses has more poetic significance than the compasses themselves (the design composed being more relevant to Donne's intentions than merely the instrument for constructing it). The import of this fact has been duly pointed out by Joan Bennet:

The circle occurs again and again in Donne's verse and in his prose as the symbol of infinity. Insensibility to such intellectual symbolism has caused, not only Dr. Johnson, but even so modern a critic as Miss Sackville-West to cite the compass image, in the *Valediction: Forbidding Mourning*, as an example of metaphysical ineptitude.<sup>9</sup>

Professor Murray then drew additional attention to this recently with his observation that the reference to gold-leaf immediately preceding the compass figure might have initially prompted Donne's use of the latter device. Although it is true enough that the poet talks about the feet of the instrument itself, a fact which has lent itself to biological interpretation which is contextually superfluous there, the compasses are clearly confined to the later stanzas of the poem whereas the image of the circle prevails throughout (note the references to "th' earth" and "spheares" in the third stanza and to the moon in the fourth). The final lines indicate without a shadow of a doubt that the poet's compasses were originated *for the sake of* the circle image and not meant to be visualized by themselves:

Thy firmness makes my circle just,  
And makes me end where I begunne.

The object of the speaker's love thus occupies the very center of the circle in the same manner as the figure of Love does for Dante.

reference to her (p. 196). Now although many of Donne's poems were written prior to 1598, the probable date of composition for "The Valediction" is 1611 (see H. M. Belden, "Donne's Compasses and Wither's Compass," *MLN*, xix (1904), 77). Consequently, there was ample time for Beatrice to have become much better known when Donne constructed his compass poem. Furthermore, since it was written after the turn of the century, Koeppel's comment concerning the lack of knowledge of *La Vita Nuova* in the sixteenth century would have substantially no historical application here. (Since completing this note, I have come upon Robert Ellrodt's suggestion that the poem might have been composed prior to May 1608, but his deductions are somewhat tentative (as he admits) and do not detract from my basic contentions. "Chronologie des Poèmes de Donne," *Etudes Anglaises*, xiii (1960), 458.)

<sup>9</sup> *Four Metaphysical Poets* (Cambridge, Eng., 1934), pp. 40-41.

There are a few other resemblances between *La Vita Nuova* and Donne's poem which bear some comparison also. The quality of the love described is similar: Dante idealizes Beatrice to the extent that he incorporates something of the Divine in her; this same element is evident in Donne's conception ("T'were prophanation of our joyes / To tell the layetie our love" which is "so much refin'd"). Donne's very title implies sublimation of the emotional ("Forbidding Mourning"). Both works deal with the problem of the absence of the lover from his beloved (revealing a spontaneity on the part of each poet suggestive of the autobiographical).<sup>7</sup> And finally both, in their use of the circle, reflect the medieval reverence for this figure as the Eucharistic form. This was natural for Dante the Roman Catholic; Donne, whose sermons reiterated the medieval tradition (he was raised an austere Catholic), frequently referred to God in terms of the geometric form.<sup>8</sup>

Accordingly, there is a common bond which links the two poets. Both are concerned with divine and human love—even to the point of ennobling the passion of man for woman by relating it to the ethereal expression of perfection found in the image of the circle. As Reverend William J. Rooney has described it (in reference to "The Canonization"), it is *αγάπη* for the sake of *ἔπος*.<sup>9</sup> Both shared a common mystical tradition, one curiously allied to Pythagorean influences in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance. Dante's *La Vita Nuova*, with its emphasis upon the magical number nine, is perhaps the most famous literary example of numerological divination; a similar love of number is evident again in Donne (most obviously in such a poem as "The Computation"). Fused with this mathematical tradition is the Scholastic one, and here (in spite of differences in technique) the close relationship between the two poets with respect to the impact upon them of the Aristotelianism of St. Thomas Aquinas is difficult to ignore. Thus Mario Praz has written that Donne's "cultural equipment was in many ways that of a Scholastic thinker; hence the curious affinity some of his poetry shows

<sup>7</sup> See M. F. Moloney's evaluation of some of Grierson's remarks in *John Donne: His Flight from Mediaevalism*, *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, XXIX (Urbana, 1944), 112-113. Cf. J. Satin, "Romeo and Juliet as Renaissance *Vita Nuova*," *Discourse*, III (1960), 67-85, here also.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., "A Sermon Preached at the Earl of Bridgewater's House" (1627) in *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. E. M. Simpson and G. K. Potter (Berkeley, 1956), VIII, 97.

<sup>9</sup> "The Canonization": The Language of Paradox Reconsidered," *ELH*, XXIII (1952), 41.

to that of Dante's circle."<sup>10</sup> H. J. C. Grierson refers to Donne's "Aire and Angels" by citing *Purgatorio*, XV.<sup>11</sup> And in the compass poem, the heavenly bodies are described in accordance with the Thomistic mode, recalling also the particular use both poets made of a concentric arrangement of the firmament.

However, M. M. Mahood, in pursuing a humanistic approach to the Donne-Dante relationship, comments as follows:

In a verse letter addressed to Wotton and conjecturally dated about 1597 or 1598, Donne advocates a stoical self-sufficiency as the soundest philosophy of life. Shortly before his marriage, he wrote again to Wotton in the same independent vein, boasting that he was 'no great voyager in other mens works: no swallower nor devourer of volumes nor pursuant of authors. Perchance it is because I find borne in my self knowledge or apprehension enough. . . .' In tune with this mood, he continues the letter by announcing that he has just 'flung aside Dant the Italian.' One is reminded of the way Faustus rejects the whole corpus of human learning with a similar gesture of contempt.<sup>12</sup>

This is a challenging statement, one which calls for a deserving response. In the second letter to Wotton mentioned (ca. 1600), Dante is criticized specifically for his treatment of Pope Celestine V. Unlike Faustus then, Donne is tending to be orthodox in his views, not heterodox; he is here striving to stay with the tradition of the Roman Church, not to stray from it by placing a member of the established hierarchy in hell.<sup>13</sup> His statement that he is "no great voyager" needs to be taken *cum grano salis*, not simply because of the context explained above, but from what we know of Donne's experience as an actual voyager,<sup>14</sup> of his extensive library,<sup>15</sup> and of the similarity between the ideas he utilized and those of others in the medieval tradition. It is true that he became acquainted with Dante's work (at least

<sup>10</sup> "Donne's Relation to the Poetry of his Time," *A Garland for John Donne*, ed. T. Spencer (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), p. 61.

<sup>11</sup> *The Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), II, 22. He also refers to *Paradiso* (III, 70-88) in connection with "The Anniversarie" (24).

<sup>12</sup> *Poetry and Humanism* (New Haven, 1950), p. 103.

<sup>13</sup> The Church itself disclaims the necessity of anyone (even Judas) being in hell. In fact, a standard prayer between decades of the rosary invokes the Saviour with the petition "Lead all souls to Heaven, especially those in most need of Thy mercy." Dante, of course, had poetic license. Cf. Donne's disagreement with Dante in the letter quoted from *supra* (however, the Pope referred to there seems to have been alluded to in the *Inferno* and not in the *Purgatorio* as Donne implies).

<sup>14</sup> See John Sparrow, "The Date of Donne's Travels," in *A Garland for John Donne*, pp. 121-151.

<sup>15</sup> See Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, Eng., 1958).

*La Divina Commedia*) relatively early in life (because of the allusion in the fourth *Satire*).<sup>16</sup> Finally, his image of the circle relates so strikingly to the figure as described by Dante that there is little doubt that he was intimately acquainted with the Florentine's writings. In *Il Convito* alone the image is frequently repeated, e. g. with reference to love:

le corpora semplici hanno amore naturato in sè al loro loco proprio, e però la terra sempre discende al centro; il fuoco alla circonferenza di sopra lungo 'l cielo della luna, e però sempre sale a quello. IV. iii. 8-13

The "perfect" circle (i. e. one constructed by compasses) is explicitly referred to:

Questa perfezione intende il Filosofo nel settimo della *Fisica*, quando dice: 'Ciascuna cosa è massimamente perfetta, quando tocca e aggiugne la sua virtù propria: e allora è massimamente perfetta secondo sua natura. Onde allora lo circolo si può dicere perfetto, quando veramente è *circolo*, cioè quando aggiugne la sua propria virtù: allora è in tutta sua natura, e allora si può dire *nobile circolo*.' *E questo è quando in esso è un punto, il quale egualmente sia distante dalla circonferenza* (etc.) IV. xvi. 77-89 (italics mine)

Compare the reference in the last canto of the *Paradiso* to the geometer and poet both contemplating the circle:

Qual è 'l geomètra che tutto s'affige  
per misurar lo cerchio, e non ritrova,  
pensando, quel principio ond'egli indige,  
tal era io a quella vista nova:  
veder volea come si convenne  
l'imgo al cerchio, e come vi s'indova. . . . XXXIII. 133-138

Consequently, since we now know that Donne did own at least a copy of *Il Convito*, it seems plausible enough that he was inspired by such treatment of the circle as indicated above. Regardless of how different his overall work was from that of the man whose productions heralded the height of the medieval period, "The Valediction; Forbidding Mourning," in the final analysis, owes much to Dante.

Ohio State University

ROBERT F. FLEISSNER

<sup>16</sup> K. W. Gransden, in *John Donne* (London, 1954), indicates that the five satires were written between 1593 and 1598 (p. 101); therefore, the fourth was likely to have been written while Donne was in Italy or shortly thereafter.



## The Realms of Being in the Epilogue of *Comus*

In the Epilogue of *Comus* the Attendant Spirit speaks in an allusive way of various heavenly regions in which immortal beings are said to exist, and one infers that he is describing a scale of ascent to the very presence of God. The eschatology seems to come from the *Phædo* although the correspondences are not as exact as one might wish.<sup>1</sup> In this note I should like to point to elaborations upon this eschatology in Ficino, with particular reference to statements and descriptions that may present something of the context of Milton's thought if they do not in all instances suggest specific sources.

The first realm the Spirit names, where Venus and Adonis are, he speaks of as the Gardens of Hesperus and also as the Elysian Fields, "Up in the broad fields of the sky" (978) — a phrase that has pretty definitely been shown to signify Plato's "true earth," lifted up in a high place beside the Ocean.<sup>2</sup> Here there is eternal summer and fragrance everywhere. As Ficino elaborates in describing this paradise, there is neither wind nor rain and the air is most temperate, "sub quo preciosissima quæque nascantur, homines acutissimi sensibus, uitaque longæui."<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere Ficino names this garden "in the broad fields of the sky" as one of two different Elysian fields:

Sint ergo eiusmodi prata sublimes quædam aeris plagæ, contiguæ sublimibus illis terræ plagis, quas in Phædone describit in paradisi terreni formam, fœlices sub uere perpetuo habere cultores. Ibidem campos quoque ponunt Elysios, terrenos inquam. Nam cœlestes Elysios cœlum habet octauum.<sup>4</sup>

The next region the Spirit names in the Epilogue is that in which Cupid and Psyche are said to live. It is not described as another Elysian Fields, nor is it placed in the eighth sphere — it is only said to be "farr above in spangled sheen" (1002), far above the realm inhabited by Venus and Adonis. But by virtue of the story of Cupid and Psyche, as well as from an indication in the Epilogue itself referring to Jove, this does seem to be the dwelling place of the gods, and as such Milton's terms for it correspond to Ficino's: "Astra tenent cœlestè solum, formæque deorum."<sup>5</sup> I do not press the point,

<sup>1</sup> The clearest exposition I know of the physical universe of the *Phædo* is Romano Guardini's, *The Death of Socrates*, London, 1948, pp. 170-3.

<sup>2</sup> See B. A. Wright, "Above the Smoke and Stir," *Times Literary Supplement*, October 27, 1945, p. 511.

<sup>3</sup> In *Phædonem Epitome* (Opera, Basel, 1576, p. 1394).

<sup>4</sup> In *decimum dialogum de Iusto* (Opera, p. 1432).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

but the allegorization to which the story of Cupid and Psyche lends itself could be towards an idea of divine "forms."

At another place Ficino speaks of a realm which would appear to deserve the description "Higher than the Spheary chime" (1020):

Totidem gradus bonis in Phædone distribuuntur, ubi asseritur animas innocentes & pias, sed expertes philosophiæ, in aëre una cum aëris corporibus facile uiuere, animas autem philosophia ciuili insuper præditas, in cælo cum cælestibus lucidisque uehiculis, denique purgatissimas super cælum absque corporibus beatissimè uiuere.<sup>6</sup>

And again, in commenting on the *Phædo*, he indicates what appears to be equally true of Milton's eschatology, a graduated decrease in the presence of the physical elements in existence:

Animæ quæ iustæ & sanctæ sine philosophia uixerunt, sublimia terræ, qualia supra descripsimus, ascendentes, in tenuissimis spiritalibusque ibi corporibus habitant. Quæ uero ciuilitè propterea Philosophatæ sunt, cum splendidis cælestibusque corporibus cælum colunt. Sed quæ per exactam Philosophiam perfectè purgatæ sunt, in locum supercælestem euolant, ubi absque corporibus omnino, ut Plato hic inquit, totum per tempus uiuunt.<sup>7</sup>

It is almost as difficult in Plato and Ficino as it is in Milton to make a clear map of this ascent, and the difficulty is acknowledged by Cicero and Macrobius and all the others who attempt to make the ideas of varying spiritual existences correspond with what were taken to be the facts of astronomy. Ficino's placing of one of the Elysian Fields in the eighth sphere is very much like Macrobius's similar identification of the Milky Way with the point of the universe at which souls may be said to enter bodily life. Ficino has another method, however, of speaking of the various heavenly realms, and this, too, dependent on Plato, and again with respect to the Zodiac, but instead of referring to the systems of the spheres he proposes four different Elysian Fields whose particular location is not signified, nor indeed is it clearly indicated that they are arranged in hierarchical order: "quatuor uicissim in campis Elysiis disponere regiones, quatuor uidelicet in Zodiaco signorum triplicitates quæ quatuor congruant uirtutum generibus, quibus quatuor expugnantur affectus, unde serena mente lumen cœleste recipitur."<sup>8</sup> And still another designation of four kinds of heavenly life is worked out by reference to the greater

<sup>6</sup> *Theologia Platonica*, XVIII, x (*Opera*, p. 421).

<sup>7</sup> *In Phædonem Epitome* (*Opera*, p. 1394).

<sup>8</sup> *Theologia Platonica*, XVIII, x (*Opera*, p. 422).

degree of immersion in matter as the soul descends from the highest heaven to regions closer and closer to the earth:

Proinde quatuor uitæ secundum quadruplicem mundi spiritum numerantur. Saturnia quidem uita in intellectu suscipiente patrem suum cælum, id est Deum cœli fabrum. Iouialis autem in intelligentia ad actionem iam mobilem declinante. Venerea in animali uirtute iam amante materiam. Dionysiaca in natura quasi ebria, id est immersa materiæ.<sup>9</sup>

Milton, too, may be thought to name four realms: that of Venus and Adonis, that of Cupid and Psyche, that of the spheary chime, and a realm beyond all these where Jove lives. There is still another heavenly place named in the masque, "the starry threshold of *Jove's* Court (1), the dwelling place of the Attendant Spirit, which is a reference, I think, to the place of habitation of a certain kind of demon,<sup>10</sup> but I know of no way of distinguishing it as a region from the places named in the Epilogue.

There remain certain problems — one cannot be sure what it is that Venus and Adonis represent, although it seems they should stand for something in an allegorical way. It is the same with Cupid and Psyche. The usual references to Spenser's use of these figures carry a certain persuasion, partly because they harmonize with the Platonism of the masque. The passages I have brought forth from Ficino are meant to support these suggestions. To me they give a fairly close idea of what I suppose Milton meant to propose as an eschatology and a celestial geography, and I think they may also have supported Milton in his intention of presenting this heavenly ascent in concrete terms. Some of the terms themselves — the naming of the Elysian Fields, for example — he may have taken over. But it is certain that as an allegory the Epilogue is incomplete. Whatever the context and whatever the sources, the Epilogue itself does not work out in an explicitly schematic way the relationship of each of the realms it names, and the characters of the beings in them, to a defined philosophical system. The suggestions are everywhere, the definitions are lacking. It is pleasant, and probably right, to speculate that Venus and Adonis represent a kind of love that the Platonists thought of as divine, and that Cupid and Psyche represent a love in some sense more divine. It is also probably right to believe that the region to which Jove may,

<sup>9</sup> In *Timæum Commentarium* (Opera, p. 1450).

<sup>10</sup> See John Arthos, *On A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle*, Ann Arbor, 1954, p. 63.

if he chooses, translate Virtue, is a celestial world where bodies are not present.

In the lack of knowledge of a specific source that presents the details of the Epilogue in the order in which Milton puts them, I think one must believe that Milton means the ideas he presents here not to have a specifically schematized reference. If this is so, I suppose it would be so for this reason, that the idea of the ascent to Heaven as the Platonists conceive of that is both more interesting poetically and more acceptable philosophically if the relationship between a concrete and an ideal geography is not spelled out. It would have the further advantage of not excluding the Christian ideas that are suggested by the reference to the intervention of deity, in particular the idea of grace.

*University of Michigan*

JOHN ARTHOS

## Summer, Winter, Spring, and Autumn in *Tom Jones*

In the context of the rivalry of Fortune and Nature in *Tom Jones*, it is significant that Tom, his father and mother, Sophia Western, and Lady Bellaston are associated with Nature's seasons in a pattern which helps to clarify their relationships to one another. The name of Tom's father is Summer, and we find at the level of metaphors and other imagery that Tom's mother is associated with winter, Tom and Sophia with spring, and Lady Bellaston with autumn. The interpretation of these associations is suggested by the passages in which they occur.

Mrs. Bridget, Mr. Allworthy's sister and the mother of Tom, is described as having a voice as "sweet as the evening breeze of Boreas in the pleasant month of November,"<sup>1</sup> and she is said to be "no improper emblem" of "a winter's morning" (p. 31).

Illegitimate Tom, regarded by Lady Bellaston as "a kind of miracle in nature" for his beauty (p. 590), is thus a miracle in nature for another reason, too—he is the natural son of the unnatural mating of Summer and winter. Basic to the theme of the novel and to the

<sup>1</sup> Henry Fielding, *Tom Jones*, Modern Library Edition, p. 22. All other references are to this text.

interpretation of these nature symbols is the fact that Tom is also, like Mr. Allworthy, what *Fielding* regards as a miracle in nature, a man of natural goodness of heart (p. 121), "a human being replete with benevolence" (p. 9).

Tom's arrival in the middle of May—just halfway between winter and summer—is associated with a glorious sunrise witnessed the next morning by Allworthy: "having sent forth streams of light, which ascended the blue firmament before him, as harbingers preceding his pomp, in the full blaze of his majesty rose the sun, than which one object alone in this lower creation could be more glorious, and that Mr. Allworthy himself presented" (p. 9).

The terms of this description link it to the first entrance of Sophia, who is to "precede" the "pomp" of spring as "the goddess Flora" strewing flowers (p. 106). In a self-conscious and half humorous excursion into the "sublime" *Fielding* writes:

May the heathen ruler of the winds confine in iron chains the boisterous limbs of noisy Boreas, and the sharp-pointed nose of bitter-biting Eurus. Do thou, sweet Zephyrus, rising from thy fragrant bed, mount the western sky, and lead on those delicious gales, the charms of which call forth the lovely Flora from her chamber, perfumed with pearly dews, when on the 1st of June, her birthday, the blooming maid, in loose attire, gently trips it over the verdant mead, where every flower rises to do her homage, till the whole field becomes enamelled, and colours contend with sweets which shall ravish her most [p. 107].

This parallel with the introduction of Tom into the novel relates Tom and Sophia to one another as children of the spring, and perhaps suggests that the love they come to have for each other is natural.

But the passage is functional in other ways, too. *Fielding* contrasts Sophia as Zephyrus or "western," with Boreas and "bitter-biting Eurus." We have seen that Bridget is associated with Boreas, but who is the bitter-biter contrasted with the sweetness of Miss Western, who is "adorned with all the charms in which nature can array her; bedecked with beauty, youth, sprightliness, innocence, modesty, and tenderness, breathing sweetness from her rosy lips, and darting brightness from her sparkling eyes" (p. 107)? According to the initial description of Lady Bellaston,

this lady . . . was now entered at least into the autumn of life, though she wore all the gaiety of youth, both in her dress and manner; nay, she contrived still to maintain the roses in her cheeks; but these, like flowers forced out of season by art, had none of that lively blooming freshness with which Nature, at the proper time, bedecks her own productions. She had, besides,

a certain imperfection, which renders some flowers, though very beautiful to the eye, very improper to be placed in a wilderness of sweets, and what above all others is most disagreeable to the breath of love [p. 616].

And so, at this level of names and metaphors, Tom, the natural son of Summer and winter, is involved with both spring and autumn; Nature and good taste incline this sun of mid-May to the goddess of spring, and Fortune would have him fall before Lady Bellaston. The patterns established subtly reinforce the other elements of the novel which develop contrasts between the natural and the unnatural.

University of Pennsylvania

PETER B. MURRAY

## The Miscegenation Theme in the Works of Thackeray

A conspicuous element in the writings of William Makepeace Thackeray is his repetition of the same or very similar details of plot, character, or incidental reference. Gordon N. Ray and Lambert Ennis have done much to support the assertion that these repetitious elements stem from their intensely autobiographical quality. Ray is convinced that "Closely scrutinized, his novels turn out to afford a kind of diary of his intimate life,"<sup>1</sup> and in *The Buried Life* investigates "the extent to which his imaginative life was dependent for sustenance on the persons who figured most intimately in his personal history."<sup>2</sup> Ennis, in his book *Thackeray: The Sentimental Cynic*, takes as one of his major purposes the "detection of more or less unsuspected, quasi-biographical elements in the major novels."<sup>3</sup> He concludes that most of Thackeray's major heroes are more or less direct reflections of his own character, and moreover that a great proportion of the women in the novels are modeled wholly or in substantial part on his female relatives.<sup>4</sup>

Neither scholar, however, has mentioned the remarkable number of mulattoes and half-breeds which appear in Thackeray's novels and sketches, and his numerous references to miscegenation. Although no direct evidence can be adduced, it seems quite probable that they may constitute still another autobiographical element in his work.

<sup>1</sup> *The Buried Life* . . . (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. v.

<sup>3</sup> Evanston, Ill., 1950, p. v.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65 and p. 73.



The novelist's father, Richmond Makepeace Thackeray, had gone out to an East India Company post in 1798, and in accordance with the custom of the country had taken a native mistress, Charlotte Sophia Rudd (sometimes called Radfield or Redfield).<sup>5</sup> A child, Sarah, was born in 1804; she married a half-caste, James Blechynden, in 1820, and died in 1841. In 1810 Richmond married Anne Becher, and the novelist was born the following year. Richmond died in 1815, leaving a will under whose terms Sarah Redfield received an annuity of one hundred pounds.

Thackeray's several references to his half-sister in his letters appear to carry an inconvertible overtone of uneasiness. In 1832, two years after he left Cambridge and a year before he lost most of his fortune in an Indian bank failure, Thackeray was obsessed by thoughts of his needy part-Indian relative, despite the fact that she was receiving an evidently adequate annuity. Having dined sumptuously with a friend on turtle and cold beef, he records in his diary: "I wish the turtle had choked me — there is poor Mrs. Blechynden starving in India, whilst I am gorging in this unconscionable way here. I must write to her."<sup>6</sup> Later that same year, Thackeray, in one of his periodic fits of self-reformation, wrote to his mother that he intended to send Mrs. Blechynden sixty pounds a year when he became of age (I, 245).

The following year brought the loss of the fortune of some eleven thousand pounds and made any assistance to her completely impossible. However, if Thackeray's wish to help her was sincere, the fact that he had already gambled away more than three thousand pounds might well have added to his chagrin (I, 507). In any event, the guilt feelings surrounding his gambling losses are abundantly evident in the letters and the diary for 1832 where the writer usually records his losses and gains in the German language. It also seems significant that these references to Mrs. Blechynden came during the height of Thackeray's gambling mania.

In 1841 Mrs. Blechynden died and Thackeray again expresses his feelings of guilt. "It is the sorest point I have on my conscience never to have taken notice of her" (II, 32). Then, ironically enough, his half-sister's annuity came into Thackeray's possession, making him richer by five hundred pounds (II, 34). His personal relations

<sup>5</sup> Gordon N. Ray, *Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846* (New York, 1955), p. 49. Ray suggests that she was probably a Eurasian.

<sup>6</sup> *The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray*, ed. Gordon N. Ray (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), I, 208. Subsequent references to the *Letters* will appear in the text.

with his Indian relatives ended in 1841 when a "black" niece came to England and stayed for a time with the novelist. Thackeray does not refer to the visit except for an amusing reference in a letter to his friend Fitzgerald (II, 367).

Thereafter Thackeray in his published correspondence says nothing of his half-caste relatives. However, the novels, sketches, and stories seem to indicate that the matter came to his mind with some regularity. Although references to the mulatto and miscegenation are most frequent in an early sketch, *The Tremendous Adventures of Major Gahagan* (1838) and *Vanity Fair* (1847-48), the same subjects appear elsewhere with surprising frequency.

In *Gahagan*, an amusing account of an Irish braggart's life in India, the reader is introduced to the half-caste wife of Colonel Jowler. Although she claims to be the daughter of a rajah, she shows no signs of noble ancestry. "She was a hideous, bloated, yellow creature, with a beard, black teeth, and red eyes; she was fat, lying, ugly, and stingy — she hated and was hated by all the world, and by her jolly husband as devotedly as any other."<sup>7</sup> The hero Gahagan is romantically interested in the Jowler's beautiful and "white" daughter Julia, who, despite one hundred and twenty-four letters of proposal, marries a native Indian, Chowder Loll, through her mother's machinations. A "very dark baby" is the result of the match.

The miscegenation theme recurs when Gahagan invades a native camp in disguise as Bobbacy Jung Bahawder, and encounters the real Bobbacy's wife, Puttee Rooge. Although the Indian prince is "completely subjugated by his ugly and odious wife,"<sup>8</sup> Puttee Rooge prefers the forceful Gahagan to her husband, falls in love with him and helps him escape the camp unharmed. The theme appears again during the siege of Puttyghur when Gahagan's new innamorata Belinda begs him to kill her if the native forces capture the fort. But when he approaches the other English ladies with the same proposal, "not one of the ladies chose to accede to it."<sup>9</sup>

Thus one of Thackeray's earliest major publications explores sexual relationships between Indians and Englishmen in several ways. Although it must be admitted that the references are essentially comic, their very number seems significant. India and miscegenation were evidently linked in Thackeray's mind.

<sup>7</sup> *The Works of William Makepeace Thackeray*, Kensington Ed. (New York, 1903 ff.), XXIII, 230.

<sup>8</sup> *Works*, XXIII, 275. She is described much like Mrs. Jowler, 285-286.

<sup>9</sup> *Works*, XXIII, 269-270.

*Vanity Fair* contains several references to mulattoes and miscegenation. Miss Swartz, a West Indian mulatto, first appears as a student who pays double tuition at Miss Pinkerton's Academy because of her wealth and her color. She comes to be connected romantically with several figures in the novel; George Osborne's father wants his son to marry her, but the boy's refusal is both prompt and distinct. "*I'm not going to marry a Hottentot Venus*" (ch. 21),<sup>10</sup> he says, having earlier called her a "Black Princess" (ch. 20). She finally chooses a young Scotch nobleman, although old Mr. Osborne himself had proposed to her after his son's refusal.

Miss Swartz's characterization is not entirely without the humorous scorn seen in the portrayal of the Indian women in *Gahagan*. Her taste in clothes is made fun of; she is described as dressing like a "she chimney-sweep on May day" (ch. 21). On the whole, however, Thackeray's satire is directed against society for its selfish attentions to Miss Swartz, not against the girl herself, who is portrayed as an amiable if rather stupid victim of society's worship of wealth.

References to miscegenation occur in several other places in the novel. Mrs. O'Dowd refers in passing to Mrs. Heavytop, who died of grief because her Colonel "was making sheep's eyes at a half-caste girl" in the West Indies (ch. 27). Mrs. Sedley considers Becky Sharp a more suitable wife for her son Jos than "a black Mrs. Sedley, and a dozen mahogany grandchildren" (ch. 6), and two of George Osborne's subordinates discuss their chief's earlier conquest of a beautiful quadroon girl. Pitt Crawley sells one of his seats in Parliament to a Mr. Quadroon.

Similar references to half-castes, mulattoes and miscegenation appear frequently in other works. An amusingly relevant example is found in the dialogue for a *Punch* cartoon of 1846. Four ladies are gossiping at a tea table:

"Married her Uncle's black footman. . . ."

"No?"

"O!"

"Law!!" <sup>11</sup>

The same situation is mentioned in *The Great Hoggarty Diamond*

<sup>10</sup> See also in *Pendennis* (1848) where Mrs. Pendennis is said to be so subservient to her son that she would be willing to kneel to a Hottentot daughter-in-law. (*Works*, IV, 110.)

<sup>11</sup> *Punch*, XI (August 15, 1846), 63.

five years earlier: "they say the admiral's daughter, Bell, was in love with a black footman."<sup>12</sup>

The sexual attractiveness of miscegenation hinted at comically above and elsewhere is more seriously treated in *The Newcomes* (1853) at a party where the Indian capitalist Rummon Loll is seen talking to "one of the handsomest young women in the room . . . who was listening to him as eagerly as Desdemona listened to Othello." In the same scene Barnes Newcome suggests that many English girls would willingly marry Loll (ch. 8).

A very similar use of the Indian native is seen in *The Lion Huntress of Belgravia* (1850) where the fraudulent Prince Bobbachi Bahawder is lionized by society because of the rumor that he is seeking a new wife for his father, the Emperor of Delhi. His overtures to Lady Nimrod are met with almost apologetic refusal, and the mass of "young ladies and mammas of London" are said to be most eager to show themselves to advantage in front of him.<sup>13</sup>

The last major mulatto character is Mr. Grenville Woolcomb in *Philip* (1861). He like Miss Swartz, is notable for his stupidity, his dark color, and his money; like his feminine counterpart, he is the darling of society, and marries Agnes Twysden at her parents' request. Thackeray contrasts Woolcomb, the selfish, ill-educated and brutal man, and the attitude of polite society toward him much as he had done earlier with Miss Swartz. Although constantly derided by such nicknames as "Othello" and "The Black Prince" he is a social success, marries well, and even gains election to Parliament because of his wealth.

Although these various references in the works of Thackeray are in themselves of little importance, and although only in *Gahagan* and *Philip* do any major dramatic incidents depend upon them, their very number appears significant. It would appear that Thackeray was strongly conscious of what he might have imagined to be a skeleton in his closet. In *Gahagan*, with its Indian setting, Colonel Jowler and his native wife and daughter are evidently parallel to Richmond Thackeray, his mistress and Sarah Blechynden. In the other stories many of the characters are other dark-skinned people, not specifically Indian natives, but insofar as Thackeray's recurrent allusions are similarly phrased, their common source in Mrs. Blechynden seems justified.

<sup>12</sup> *Works*, XIX, 27.

<sup>13</sup> *Works*, XXXI, 336-339.

References in the letters show that Mrs. Blechynden became for a brief time an emotionally charged figure for the novelist, and the repeated use of the mulatto in the novels reinforces this view. The references to miscegenation and allied topics, originating in the writer's own family history, were used both as a permitted form of sexual humor and more seriously to emphasize one of the major contentions of the novels: English society is so money-centered that it will do anything, even marry into another race, to gain wealth.

Iowa State University

PHILLIPS GEORGE DAVIES

## The Iconographic Sources of Auden's "Musée des Beaux Arts"

The last eight lines of W. H. Auden's "Musée des Beaux Arts" (*Another Time*, New York, 1940, p. 34) derive from a viewing of Bruegel's *The Fall of Icarus*, a painting in the collection of the Brussels Musée Royaux des Beaux Arts:

In Breughel's *Icarus*, for instance: how everything turns away  
Quite leisurely from the disaster; the ploughman may  
Have heard the splash, the forsaken cry,  
But for him it was not an important failure; the sun shone  
As it had to on the white legs disappearing into the green  
Water; and the expensive delicate ship that must have seen  
Something amazing, a boy falling out of the sky,  
Had somewhere else to get to and sailed calmly on.

These details instance a generalization with which the poem begins: "About suffering they were never wrong / The Old Masters; how well they understood / Its human position" as an experience commonly occurring in the midst of human indifference. Although he thus speaks of "Old Masters" so off-handedly, the fact is that the persona of the poem takes the graphic materials in the first part of the poem from still other paintings by Bruegel. These paintings specify more precisely other examples of suffering, which thus underlie the bitter ironies masked by the laconic voice of the persona, presumably a visitor to the gallery of the *musée*. Conjoining widely separated historical events, those in the paintings, and implicitly those of the late 1930's, Auden's poem thus re-states in a verbal medium the figural

view of history imaged in Bruegel's plastic art. A figural view of history assumes that all human events are related and continuous, and Auden has recently again expressed his dismay before "the atomization of time — the most terrible thing that is happening in the world today" (in a television broadcast of the program *Open End*, WGBH-TV, Channel 2, Boston, 4 August 1960).

Bruegel's interest in the continuity of human events manifests itself in his anachronistic treatment of historical, usually Biblical, events that are infused with the homely realism of the every-day life of the Netherlands in the sixteenth century. His *Road to Calvary*, for example, looks like a country holiday being enacted before a hill topped by a windmill; a gaily-dressed procession winds across a field and into the right background distance, where crowds of people seem to be engaged in field sports. The painting is full of movement and color that obscure in the midst of the procession the Christ bearing his cross. The crowds in the right background prove to be spectators at Calvary. Here is the first part of Auden's poem:

About suffering they were never wrong  
 The Old Masters; how well they understood  
 Its human position; how it takes place  
 While someone else is eating or opening a window or just  
     walking dully along;  
 How, when the aged are reverently, passionately waiting  
 For the miraculous birth, there always must be  
 Children who did not especially want it to happen, skating  
 On a pond at the edge of the wood:  
 They never forgot  
 That even the dreadful martyrdom must run its course  
 Anyhow in a corner, some untidy spot  
 Where dogs go on with their doggy life and the torturer's  
     horse  
 Scratches its innocent behind on a tree.  
 In Breughel's *Icarus*, for instance: . . .

Bruegel's *The Census at Bethlehem* (also in the Brussels Museum) is specifically relevant to the material in lines 3 and 4. It shows Joseph and Mary making their way through a crowd of Flemings converged upon a make-shift census bureau in a Flemish village square. Mary is mounted on an ass, and Joseph is pointing towards the office, while, in Auden's words, "someone else is eating or opening a window or just walking dully along." In two versions of *The Adoration of the Magi*, Bruegel's, like Auden's, "aged [have been] . . . reverently,



passionately waiting / For the miraculous birth" of Christ. The later and more pertinent version (at Winterthur) looks like a winter landscape crowded with Flemish burghers pressing forward through the delicately falling snow towards the stall of an inn; in the right foreground is one of Auden's "Children who did not especially want it to happen," not, as in the poem, "skating on a pond at the edge of the wood" but sliding on the ice in a circular sled; someone is hauling water just dipped from a hole in the ice, oblivious to the momentous event taking place a step away. Many of the indifferent children appear in *The Census at Bethlehem*. Donning his skates with his back to Mary and Joseph, one child sits at the edge of a frozen pond; other children are whipping tops, skating, and pulling and riding sleds in both the right foreground and left background. Auden's phrase "the dreadful martyrdom" glances at the Christ story, but it refers specifically to Bruegel's *The Massacre of the Innocents* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). There the martyrdom "runs its course" in what at first seems a pretty scene of Flemish winter revelry in a village square full of gaily gesticulating figures. They are painted in bright chromatic colors that contrast strongly with the white snow and with a group of grey, armored, and mounted soldiers in the middle background. On close inspection, the painting reveals its gruesome account of the Herod story in anachronistic terms of a sixteenth-century Spanish persecution of the Flemings. "Anyhow," as Auden's poem reads, "in a corner, some untidy spot / . . . dogs go on with their doggy life." One of the dogs in the painting leaps playfully along beside a mother clutching a child to her bosom. She is being pursued by a Spanish soldier with sword in hand, and all three — mother, dog, and soldier — are racing towards the edge of the painting, the corner of the left foreground. "The torturer's horse" of the poem is not scratching "its innocent behind on a tree," but several horses, riderless presumably because their masters are busily slaughtering the townspeople, are tethered to trees near the main force of soldiers, who are stolidly, indifferently, blocking escape and observing the carnage. Indifferent horses and dogs dot the landscape of *The Road to Calvary* also.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Black and white reproductions of all these paintings may be examined in Max J. Friedländer's *Die Alterniederländische Malerei*, 14 vols., Berlin and Leiden, 1924-1937, XIV: Pieter Bruegel, which does not, however, print a version of *The Massacre of the Innocents*. Color reproductions, except for the later version of *The Adoration of the Magi*, appear in Robert Genaille, *Bruegel L'Ancien*, Paris, 1953. See Leo Bruhns, *Das Bruegel Buch*, Vienna, 1941, Plate

The relevance of these paintings to a correct interpretation of the poem becomes quite clear if a reading is attempted without knowledge of them. Remarking the indifference to suffering in the poem alone, Mr. Maurice Charney has recently noted that "in this sense of the importunate demands of daily life, Breughel's *Icarus* becomes an example of ironic humor" ("Sir Lewis Namier and Auden's 'Musée des Beaux Arts,'" *PQ*, xxxix [1960], 131). The pathway to this view of the poem as humorous begins with the reductive assumption that Auden's source is Namier's *England in the Age of the American Revolution* (London, 1930, pp. 147-149). Namier is quoted as seeing history "made up of juggernauts, revolting to human feeling in their blindness, supremely humorous in their stupidity" (p. 148); history can therefore be rightly understood only at "an astronomical distance" from the events. "Historical comedy" derives from "a searching insight" into "the deeper irrelevancies and incoherence of human actions, which are not so much directed by reason as invested by it *ex post facto* with the appearance of logic and rationality" (p. 147). Coincidentally Namier illustrates these views by citing Bruegel's *Icarus* as an item of historical comedy, and Mr. Charney alertly detects the similarity between Namier and Auden. But Auden's book *Another Time* is full of a witty awareness of complex time, and even if he had sometime or other seen Namier's work, he seems not to have found it necessary to go to school to Namier for a figural view of history and of its ironies, both comic and tragic. Thus "Spain 1937" (*Another Time*, p. 89) is structured almost entirely by the ironic conjunction of past and present. "Brussels in Winter" speaks of "a look [that] contains the history of man" (p. 17). "Poem XV" ("The hour glass whispers to the lion's paw") mentions the "many errors that Time has patience for" (p. 23). "In Memory of Sigmund Freud" explores the extension of indifference into hatred by reporting the contemporary view of Freud as a Judas (p. 105). A major theme of "September 1, 1939" is contemporary indifference to suffering;

30, for *The Adoration of the Magi*, sometimes called *The Adoration of the Kings in the Snow*. All the paintings, some in color and some in black and white, are reproduced in F. Grossmann, *Bruegel: The Paintings*, Complete Edition, London, 1955. Note, however, that Grossmann reproduces some versions of these paintings that are not relevant to Auden's poem. One *Fall of Icarus* has a Dedalus flying through the air. The London National Gallery *Adoration of the Magi* seems not related to the poem. And the Hampton Court copy of *The Massacre of the Innocents* has had the children painted out of it, so that the subject has been obscured. The "Christmas" paintings were reprinted in *Life*, xxxvii (December 27, 1954).

the persona in his dive on Fifty-second Street sees "Faces along the bar / Cling to their average day: / The lights must never go out, / The music must always play" (p. 99). He asserts the need to "suffer all over again" all of history's pain and grief and mismanagement (p. 99). And echoing the reflections on Bruegel's *Icarus* in a different key is "Poem XXX" ("For us like any other fugitive"): "No one has yet believed or liked a lie, / Another time has other lives to live," that is, in the midst of man's inhumanity to man.

Like all these poems, "Musée des Beaux Arts" alludes obliquely to the historical agony of mankind as it was working itself out in the 1930's, a period from which Auden was at no astronomical distance. His poem is ironic but not humorous. It is witty, and its wit lies in the conjunction of events separate in time but similar in quality as instances of martyrdom and suffering. It thus becomes deadly serious, a lasting and powerful example of tragic irony skillfully strung on the deceptive tensions of a lyric poem. Once the Christian paintings of Bruegel are made to supply a suitable context for the *Icarus*, "the forsaken cry" of "the boy falling out of the sky" changes the tone of the poem significantly. We remember that Icarus' "failure," his "splash," begins itself in a story of murder. Dedalus' jealous slaying of Perdix made a refugee of the fabled artificer. Icarus, we might say, is martyred to his own father's anger. Although the partridge in Ovid's account sings a joyful note as Dedalus is burying his son, to Ovid Dedalus is "pater infelix" (*Metamorphoses*, VI. 46). Bruegel, as one art critic has put it, may indeed have been thumbing his nose at Mediterranean art and classical mythology (Thomas Craven, *A Treasury of Art Masterpieces: From the Renaissance to the Present Day*, New York, 1939, p. 222), but Auden's poem belongs to the realm of *saeva indignatio*, masked though it may be in the purposeful indifference of the persona's calm voice.

In the Bruegel paintings, the anachronism and the unemphatic treatment of the events seem clearly suggestive of the theme of Auden's poem. Mr. Charney concludes rightly, if too broadly, that by Auden's lights human indifference to suffering brooks no tarrying "for mere symbolic or mythological purposes" (p. 131). The indifference theme in the poem arises not from some general myth or symbol but from the Christ story, which is then refracted to shed light on the everyday events of Auden's war-torn world of the 1930's. Bruegel's painting of "the dreadful martyrdom" is not comic at all. Through the Herod materials it lays bare the brutal meaning of the Spanish Occu-

pation. It looks both ways in time, and so also does Auden's poem, whose very title is compact with meaning. It refers first to the surface matter of the poem, the fine arts of the "Old Masters" which in the 1930's were being desecrated all over Europe, including those countries whose museums housed Bruegel's works. It was a Europe where "the kingdoms [were] . . . at war" (*Another Time*, p. 110). The title alludes also to the fine art of Dedalus, whose invention was destructively producing yet another martyrdom, by which "matters are settled with gas and with bomb" (*Another Time*, p. 13), a use he did not anticipate when "*ignotas animum dimittit in artes, / Naturamque novat*" (*Metamorphoses*, VI. 160-161).

Finally there is nothing merely of "ironic humor" in the order of Auden's allusions to Bruegel's paintings of the Christ story: the conception, the birth, and, closely associated with the birth, a martyrdom which already prefigures the failure of the Christian mission, especially when, from Auden's vantage point, martyrdom can be seen recurring not only in classical times, in Biblical Israel, and in sixteenth-century Flanders but equally in *another time*, his own. Thus there are ironies within ironies in Auden's poem, but they are touched by something deeper than humor and broader than an iconographic joke.

Babson Institute

MAX BLUESTONE

## Die Etymologie des Wortes *Kux*

Das Wort *Kux* = *Bergwerksanteil* kam auf, als die süddeutschen Bergwerke ihre grosse Blüte erlebten. Es erscheint zum ersten Mal 1472 in einer Schneeberger Bergrechnung. Dass es um diese Zeit noch ziemlich unbekannt war, zeigt das Gespräch in von Kalbes *Bergbüchlein* (um 1500), wo der junge Knappe die Bedeutung des Wortes nicht kennt. Sie wird ihm vom erfahrenen Bergmann erklärt. "Sunder ein Kucks ist ein hundertachtundtzwentzig teil alles dess das dem bereckwerckt zugehordt."<sup>1</sup> Seitdem erscheint das Wort häufig bis auf dem heutigen Tag, sowohl in der Bergwerks wie auch in der Kaufmannssprache.

Von Anfang an bedeutet *Kux* "Teil des Wertes oder des Gewinns

<sup>1</sup> W. Pieper, *Ulrich Rülein von Calw und sein Bergbüchlein* (Freiberger Forschungshefte, Kultur und Technik D7), Berlin, 1955, S. 69.

eines Bergwerks," (eine Art Anteilschein) und zwar ursprünglich den 64. oder 66. Teil, später, als die Bergwerke sich dank der verbesserten Technik erweiterten, den 128. Teil; heutzutage ist es in Deutschland der 1000. Teil. Nachdem die Bergwerkswirtschaft sich so entwickelt hatte, dass nicht mehr ausschliesslich die aktiven Bergleute sondern auch Aussenstehende am Gewinn Anteil hatten, wurde *Kux* immer mehr Synonym von *Aktie*. Die Bedeutung *Teil* war so wenig bewusst, dass 1577 Johann P. von Zwengel in seinem *Neuw grosz Formular Buch* von einem *Guckestheil* spricht, während man in einer Bergordnung vom Jahre 1521 zwischen den *Teilen* eines Bergwerks und den *Kucksen* unterschied: "Der Schichtmeister soll ein vleiszig Aufsehen haben, das er nicht mer zu einer Gruben dann zwen und dreiszig *Tail* mach, und nit anders schreib, dan ein *Tail* . . . und kainen *Guckes* schreib." <sup>2</sup>

*Kux* wurde eines der meist gebrauchten Wörter in der Bergwerkssprache und erschien in verschiedene Redewendungen, z. B. *Kux liegen lassen* (aufhören zu bauen) oder *in Kux gehen* (zu Grunde gehen). Vergl. schweiz. dt. *Guggus* (*Guggis*) = bankrott, ökonomisch heruntergekommen. <sup>3</sup> Das Wort kommt im 15. und 16. Jh. sowohl mit anlautendem *g* als mit *k* vor, wobei die *g*-Formen dem Süden angehören, die *k*-Formen im Norden beheimatet sind. Man findet sie geschrieben wie: *Guckus*, *Guckes*, *Guckis*, *Guckas*, *Guggis*, *Kukus*, *Kukes*, *Kukis*, *Kucks*, *Kuss*. Der Zwickauer Agricola schreibt *Kuckus* (1556), sein Basler Uebersetzer Beck *Guggus* (1559). Dabei ist zu bemerken, dass nur die *k*-Formen kontrahiert werden.

Die Etymologie des Wortes ist unklar. Wick <sup>4</sup> behauptet ohne Vorbehalt, dass das Wort aus dem Tschechischen stammt; diese Etymologie finden wir u. a. auch in Kluge-Götze 16. 429, in *DWB*, V, 2914, bei Mackensen in *Sprache und Technik*, <sup>5</sup> und zuletzt in Wolffs *Studien zur deutschen Bergmannssprache* (1958). Bach <sup>6</sup> sagt etwas vorsichtiger, *Kux* "ist wohl slawischer Herkunft," und Schirmer <sup>7</sup> gebraucht das Wort *vielleicht*. Ehrenzweig <sup>8</sup> widmet dem Worte *Kux*

<sup>2</sup> Aus: *Erbendorfer Bergfreyheiten* von 1521. Zitiert in J. G. Lori, *Sammlung des Baierischen Bergrechts*, München, 1764, S. 170.

<sup>3</sup> *Schweizerisches Idiotikon*, II, Sp. 181.

<sup>4</sup> Ph. Wick, *Die slavischen Lehnwörter in der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache*, Marburg, 1939, S. 37.

<sup>5</sup> Lüneburg, 1954, S. 45.

<sup>6</sup> A. Bach, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, Heidelberg, 1956, S. 45.

<sup>7</sup> A. Schirmer, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Kaufmannssprache*, Strassburg, 1911, S. 116.

<sup>8</sup> Ehrenzweig, "Das Wort *Kux*," *Zs. f. Bergrecht*, LXII (1921), S. 192.

eine Sonderuntersuchung und versucht, es vom gr. *kokkos* (Kern) herzuleiten. Er kann aber nicht umhin, es dennoch auf dem Wege über das Tschechische in die deutsche Sprache kommen zu lassen.

Die Anhänger der slawischen Etymologie weisen auf das tschechische Wort *kus* hin (Dim. *kusek*), das *Stück, Teil* bedeutet. Da die unkontrahierten Formen *Guggus* und *Kukus* die ältesten sind, müssen Wick und die anderen Anhänger der slaw. Theorie entweder Reduplikation von *kus* annehmen oder Metathesis der Dim. Form, die entstehen würde, weil bei dem nicht-slawischen Bevölkerungsteil leicht eine Umstellung im Wortlaut eintreten könne. So müsste *kusek* als *kukes* aufgenommen worden sein. Die Metathesis hätte sich gleichzeitig mit der Entlehnung vollzogen, denn eine Form *kusek* ist nicht belegt. Eine weitere Schwierigkeit bietet die Erklärung der *us*-Endung, die in den ältesten Formen vorhanden ist.

Die böhmische Herkunft wird schon von Adelung abgelehnt<sup>9</sup> und zwar sehr logisch auf Grund der Tatsache, dass die Böhmen den Bergbau von den Deutschen gelernt und ihn anfänglich durch deutsche Bergleute betrieben haben. Dieses Argument ist auch jetzt noch stichhaltig, denn es waren tatsächlich die Deutschen, die die Böhmen den Bergbau lehrten. Deshalb meint Zirkel:<sup>10</sup>

Den neueren sprachlichen Forschungen gemäss, . . . liegt die Sache gerade umgekehrt, die slaw. Bergleute haben diese Bezeichnungen aus dem Deutschen in Empfang genommen und ihrer eigenen Sprache mundgerecht gemacht. Dasselbe dürfte auch bei dem vielbesprochenen und noch immer nicht ganz enträtselten Worte *Kux* der Fall sein.

Zu den obigen Schwierigkeiten kommt hinzu, dass schon im 16. Jahrhundert die böhmische Herkunft von *Kux* vergessen scheint. Mathesius<sup>11</sup> meint, dass das Wort abgeleitet sei von dem Namen eines Mannes in Schneeberg, *Kux* geheissen, der zuerst die Teilung der Zeche in 128 Teile erfunden habe. Berward<sup>12</sup> behauptet, der Name des Mannes sei *Kukusz*. Wichtiger ist, dass in dieser Zeit auch die tschechische Sprache das Bergwerkswort nur in der deutschen Form kennt und es von dem böhm. Wort für *Teil* = *kus* unter-

<sup>9</sup> J. Chr. Adelung, *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*, II, Leipzig, 1788, Sp. 1856.

<sup>10</sup> Zirkel, "Zur Geschichte des sächsischen Bergbaus," *Zs. f. Bergrecht*, xxviii (1887), S. 347.

<sup>11</sup> J. Mathesius, *Sarepta oder Bergpostill*, Nürnberg, 1564, S. 152b.

<sup>12</sup> Chr. Berward, *Interpres phraeseologiae metallurgicae*, Frenckfurt am Mayn, 1702, S. 5.



scheidet.<sup>13</sup> Da müsste es also eine sehr frühe Rückentlehnung gegeben haben. Auch im modernen Tschech. heisst *Stück* = *kus*, aber *Bergwerksaktie* = *kukus*. Schliesslich ist es verdächtig, dass die slaw. Theorie aus dem 18. Jahrhundert stammt, also aus der Zeit, da man versuchte, eine ganze Menge Wörter aus dem Slawischen herzuleiten, wie *Schacht*, *Flötz*, *Kies*, *Stollen*, *Schicht*, *Zeche*, die heute alle als Wörter germanischen Ursprungs betrachtet werden. Wir möchten versuchen, an Berwards Bemerkung "andere dereviren es von *gucken*" anknüpfend, das Wort *Kuz* ohne slaw. Ursprung zu erklären.

Wie oben gesagt, hat *Kuz* von Anfang an die Nebenbedeutung "wertvoller Besitz, Aktie." Genau wie im 17. Jahrhundert mit den Blumenzwiebeln wurde im 16. Jahrhundert mit den Kuxen gehandelt und spekuliert. Deshalb konnte Seb. Brant schreiben:<sup>14</sup> "Der Guckusz manchen tribt von husz Der vor gar sanfft, und trucken sas. . . ." Diese Stelle bezieht sich auf den Alchimisten, der "stoszt sin gût jns affenglasz Bisz ers zû pulver so verbrent Das er sich selber nit me kennt." *Guckusz* bewahrt hier etwas von der Bedeutung: so intensiv auf ein Objekt oder ein Ziel schauen, dass man alles andere vergisst.<sup>15</sup> Dies zeigt seine Verwandtschaft mit *gucken* = *schauen*. In einem Zitat in *DWB*<sup>16</sup> aus Artomedes, *Erklärung des Catechismus* (1605), finden wir das Wort *vergucken* = zu sehr auf ein besonderes Ding schauen, und dadurch alles andere verlieren, in Zusammenhang mit *Guckes*. "Die Menschen suchen mancherlei Wege zur Vergebung der Sünden, schlagen hie und dort, suchen in diesem und jenem *Guckes* und *vergucken* darüber Leib und Seel." Trübner<sup>17</sup> gibt ein Zitat aus Hans Sachs' *Fastnachtsp.* (1535) 8, 309 ndr.: "Das du *verguckest* wasz du hast und werdest deins Guts ein fremder Gast! Bergwerck verderben manchen Man. . . ." In beiden Fällen gibt es wohl ein Wortspiel mit *vergucken*, das sowohl *verspekulieren* bedeutet, als auch "so sehr auf ein Ding schauen, dass man alles andere vergisst (und deshalb verliert)." Im *Märe vom Feldbauer* und in *Froschmeuseler* erscheint *vergucken* (*verkucken*) ebenso zweideutig,

<sup>13</sup> Daniel Adamus II, *Sylva quadrilinguis*, Prag, 1598, S. 546. In Diefenbach, *Mtlat. — Lat.-böhm. Wtb. nach einer Hs. vom Jahre 1470*, Frankfurt, 1846 kommt *kukus* nicht vor. Auch Dasypodius, *Dictionarum Latinobohemicum*, 1560, kennt das Wort nicht.

<sup>14</sup> Seb. Brant, *Das Narrenschiff*, Hrs. Zarneke, Leipzig, 1854, S. 98.

<sup>15</sup> Man könnte hier an *Guckus* (*Kuckuk*) = *Teufel* denken (*Schweiz. Id.*, II, Sp. 184). Jedoch passt u. E. *Spekulation* besser, denn die Alchimisten experimentieren lediglich um materiellen Vorteil zu erhalten.

<sup>16</sup> *DWB*, IV, I. 6, Sp. 1039.

<sup>17</sup> Trübners *deutsches Wörterbuch*, IV, Berlin, 1943, S. 323.

vom *DWB*, V, 2912 erklärt als "einbüßen durch Gucken, verschwenden mit Kuxen." Ist aber *vergucken* = *verspekulieren*, so wäre *gucken* syn. von *spekulieren*, und dieses finden wir schon angedeutet in Seb. Francks *Sprichwörter*, 2. 83c, zitiert von M. Heyne, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, I, Leipzig, 1905, Sp. 1271: "ins Bergwerk gucken = unnütze Arbeit verrichten." Also: Intensiv ins Bergwerk schauen und nichts ausrichten, aber leicht kann dies werden: *spekulieren*, was hinweist auf diejenigen, die nicht in dem Bergwerk arbeiteten, wohl aber finanziell beteiligt waren. Anfangs wurden solche Personen als sündige Nichtsnutze betrachtet, und sogar Luther weigerte sich einen Kux als Geschenk anzunehmen.

*Gucken* ist syn. mit *schauen*, und *schauen* wird im Lat. mit *speculari* übersetzt. So ist *gucken* dann auch syn. von *speculari*, und wir sehen bei beiden Zeitwörtern eine parallele Bedeutungsentwicklung. *Gucken* drückt "sehen mit aufmerksam blickendem Auge, lauern" aus, wobei die Aufmerksamkeit des Blickes zu betonen ist.<sup>18</sup> Da kann der Blick speziell auf Chance für finanziellen oder jedenfalls materiellen Erfolg gerichtet werden. Der Wortinhalt birgt immer etwas mehr als nur *sehen*. *DWB*, IV, 1. 6, Sp. 1032 gibt "*gucken* = die anspannung des aufmerksam blickenden Auges, sein ausdrück und seine richtung wird besonders hervorgehoben." Im Schweizerdeutschen bedeutet *gugge* sogar *abwarten*, *sich bedenken*, *überlegen*.<sup>19</sup> *Speculari* = beobachten, belauern, wurde auf Deutsch *spekulieren*, die Chance beobachten, durch Wahrscheinlichkeitsgründe auf Erfolg rechnen, meistens auf finanziellen Erfolg. Das nl. kennt ein aus der Judensprache hergekommenes *gokken*, mit der Bedeutung *spekulieren*. Aber Diefenbach<sup>20</sup> gibt für das dt. *gucken* die Nebenform *gocken* ("visere, schouwen, vel gokken"). Also auch auf diesem Weg kommen wir zu *gucken* = *spekulieren*. Zu *spekulieren* gehört das Substantiv *Spekula*, Warte, Ort des spähenden Ausschauens. Zu *gucken* gehört *Guggus*, Fenster, Guckloch.<sup>21</sup> Eine *Spekulation* ist ein Unternehmen, wobei man nach Erfolg ausschaut und auf Erfolg rechnen zu können glaubt. Dieselbe Bedeutung gilt für *Guggus*. Der Besitz eines Bergwerkanteils war eine Spekulation und deshalb von vielen ehrbaren Leuten als Sünde betrachtet. Durch zu viel *spekulieren* aber kann man leicht sein Geld

<sup>18</sup> *DWB*, IV, 1. 6, Sp. 1032.

<sup>19</sup> *Schweiz. Id.*, II, Sp. 182.

<sup>20</sup> L. Diefenbach, *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum*, Francofurti ad Moenum, 1857, S. 623.

<sup>21</sup> Im Schweizdt. ist *Guggus* ein Versteckenspiel, wobei man ruft: "*Guggus!* (Schau gut!)."

verlieren und faillieren. Die Wörter *Guggus* und *Guggis* haben im Schweizerdeutsch dergleiche Bedeutung wie *bankrott*, *ökonomisch heruntergekommen*. *Guggus* aber war auch dasjenige, womit man spekuliert, wie *Aktie* dasjenige ist, womit man handelt, also nicht nur der Handel selber.

Neben *gucken*, das ebensowenig wie *Guggus* oder *Kukus* (*Kux*) vor dem 15. Jh., also vor der Blütezeit der südöstlichen Bergwerke, nachgewiesen werden kann, erscheint im Norden *kucken*. Parallel zu *Guggus* (*-is*, *-es*) im Süden, finden wir im Norden *Kukus* (*-is*, *-es*), kontrahiert zu *Kuks*. Mit dem Sieg des Meissnerdeutschen erhielt die nördliche *k*-Form die Ueberhand. Dieser Sieg geht parallel mit der ökonomischen Hochkonjunktur, und dazu hat die Ausbeute der Bergwerke nicht wenig beigetragen. Es ist denn auch vom meissnischen Sachsen, dass mit der deutschen Bergwerkstechnik, die Terminologie der Bergwerkssprache ins Ausland drang, nach Skandinavien sowohl wie ins Böhmerland.<sup>22</sup> Das Freiburger Bergrecht wurde das Vorbild für Böhmen. Deutsche Bergleute arbeiteten in den böhmischen Bergwerken unter hohem Ansehen. Da könnte leicht, ebenso wie *šichta* (Schiebt), *štola* (Stollen), *šachta* (Schacht), auch das Wort *Kukus*, also die ältere, noch unkontrahierte Form, mit ihnen in die tschechische Sprache eingeführt worden sein.

Aus den obigen Erwägungen möchten wir den Schluss ziehen, dass die mhd. Form *Kux*, zusammengezogen aus nördlichem *Kukkus* (*-is*, *-es*) oder südlichem *Guggus* (*-is*, *-es*), vom Germanischen und nicht vom Slawischen her stammt.

Lewis College

JUDY MENDELS

## REVIEWS

Henry M. Hoenigswald, *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction* (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1960. viii + 168 pp. \$5.00). HENRY M. Hoenigswald has been concerned in his work with the problems that classical and Indo-European linguistics pose to contemporary linguistic science. His publications include a

<sup>22</sup> M. Wilsdorf, *Georg Agricola und seine Zeit*, Berlin, 1956, S. 67.

grammar of Spoken Hindustani<sup>1</sup> and various articles (outstanding is "The Principal Step in Comparative Grammar").<sup>2</sup> The latter is a systematic presentation of the step from allophonic to phonemic reconstruction — from reconstitution of the sounds of an extinct language to the structure within which they acquired meaning. Hoenigswald's most important contribution is, nonetheless, the present book.

The purpose of the book is twofold: (1) the codification and methodology of the comparison of contrasts in the structure of different synchronic layers in the history of a language, or related languages, to build a solid ground for the reconstruction of an unrecorded layer; (2) providing a unified terminology for those procedures.<sup>3</sup>

In the Introduction (pp. 1-3), the author sets up the basic concepts of language change in time and the premises for dealing with it in historical and comparative linguistics. Any linguistic evidence must be considered static in itself because it is confined to a given period of time. Therefore, its study must make use of synchronic methods. When we observe a disagreement between two sets of related evidence of different periods, we call the disagreement a change, and other methods — those of historical (diachronic) linguistics — have to be employed. The disappearance of certain features of language and the independent emerging of others is called amorphous change, and it is relevant more to history than to linguistics. The important change that reveals a shift in structure is replacement of parts of language by others. This change (the main concern of historical linguistics) furnishes the material out of which a stage of a language can be reconstructed. The material may come only from the language concerned, or it may be provided by several related languages, in which case we speak of either internal or external comparative reconstruction. However, the prerequisite of those procedures remains a synchronic phonemic and grammatical analysis of the stages that are available.

The difficulty of availing oneself of a past stage of a language is treated systematically in a separate chapter (pp. 4-12) on graphemics, or interpretation of written records especially in terms of phonetics

<sup>1</sup> Henry M. Hoenigswald, *Spoken Hindustani, Basic Course* . . . 2 vols. (Silver Spring, Md.: Linguistic Society of America, 1945-1946).

<sup>2</sup> *Language* 26 (1950), pp. 357-364; reprinted in Martin Joos, ed., *Readings in Linguistics* (Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1957), pp. 298-302.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Preface, pp. v-vi.

and phonemics. This is one of the first exhaustive treatments of the theory of graphemics.<sup>4</sup>

Chapters 3-4 (pp. 13-47)<sup>5</sup> elaborate in detail the amorphous and the replacement types of morphological change. The latter type is structural change proper. Special discussion is devoted to replacements by semantic and analogic changes, by merger and split of morphemes. Phonemic relationship of the replacing and the replaced forms, or, in other words, the eventual sound change involved, is dealt with in Chapter 5 (pp. 48-58). Chapter 6 (pp. 59-67) analyzes the distributional spread of a new form resulting from a change. Chapter 7 (pp. 68-71) is about the application of the internal and comparative methods to the reconstruction of morphemes.

Sound change as a corollary of morphemic change was the subject of Chapter 5; the details of sound change, not without the inevitable regard to morphemic structure, are the subject of the analysis contained in Chapters 8-12 (pp. 72-143). Of these, Chapter 8 (pp. 72-85) investigates phonetic reasons for sound change; Chapter 9 (pp. 86-98), the patterns (various types of split and merger) in which it takes place; Chapter 10 (pp. 99-111), its phonemic and/or morphemic consequences manifested as alternating forms; Chapter 11 (pp. 112-117), the relationship in time of three rather than two stages of a historical sound development (relative chronology); Chapter 12 (pp. 119-143) establishes the different types of relationship between two sister languages (each type resulting from a different sound-change situation); it describes the comparative method of phonemic reconstruction of the mother language and evaluates that method on the basis of its comparison with that of internal reconstruction; it adds, moreover, two sample reconstructions of Indo-European.

The phonological and morphological relationship of more than two sister languages and the reconstruction of their common ancestor present special problems; methods for the solution of the hierarchy and subgrouping within families of languages are demonstrated in Chapter 13 (pp. 144-160), together with the implications of such methods for the reconstruction of the proto-language.

A bibliography of references mentioned in the footnotes (pp. 161-165),<sup>6</sup> and an index of subject items (pp. 167-168) conclude the book.

<sup>4</sup> The first is Robert A. Hall, Jr., *A Theory of Graphemics* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1957). (Mimeographed.)

<sup>5</sup> On p. 25 there is an oversight in transcribing phonemically as /tsf/ instead of as /tsv/ the German initial spelling *zw-* (e.g. *Zwetschkenknödel*) and as /šf/ instead of as /šv/ the German initial Spelling *sch-* (e.g. *Schwiegermutter*).

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*

As stated above, the author's aim is codification of structural linguistic reconstruction. By his insistence on a clear preliminary descriptive statement and its separation from any subsequent diachronic study, the author proves his firm adherence to de Saussure's maxim: "[Il] nous [est] interdit absolument d'étudier simultanément les rapports dans le temps et les rapports dans le système."<sup>7</sup> In de Saussure, considerations of language are oriented toward systematization (a logical continuation of neogrammarianism) and it is there that a lacuna awaits his followers. His great disciple Meillet pointed to the moving spirit of linguistic systems: "... la langue ... est une réalité, non pas seulement physiologique et psychique, mais aussi, et avant tout, *sociale*."<sup>8</sup> Yet a criticism of de Saussure may lead to neolinguistic iconoclasm<sup>9</sup> or to idealistic quasi-mysticism ("... dass die Sprache ... ältere, höhere und innigere als nur soziale und reflektierte Zwecke erfüllt, ..."<sup>10</sup>). There is a narrow road between neolinguistics or linguistic idealism on one side and the neogrammarians' rules on the other side. Von Wartburg, in agreement with Meillet, shows that road when he reconciles de Saussure's antinomy by stating that linguistics, synchronic and diachronic, is a method, not the object of the study of language; this object is the language itself which depends both on its system and on its users, thus integrating history and structure into one indivisible whole.<sup>11</sup>

In this book structure alone seems to be at a loss for an explanation when it positively denies for structural reasons that sound change has phonetic gradualness (pp. 72-73). The example chosen (the disappearance of a voiceless stop) does not leave, by its nature, much room for the assumption of a gradual process. But diphthongization, for instance, has to be considered as gradual phonetic change. Structure alone would suggest positional allophones before the emergence of a

*auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprache*, which is the present title of the journal founded by Adalbert Kuhn in 1852, is also known under the name *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, the basis of the abbreviation *KZ* used in the book.

<sup>7</sup> Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, ed. by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, with the collab. of Albert Riedlinger; 4th ed. (Paris: Payot, 1949), p. 116.

<sup>8</sup> Antoine Meillet, *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 8th ed., rev. (Paris: Hachette, 1949), p. 18.

<sup>9</sup> Giuliano Bonfante, "The neolinguistic position (A reply to Hall's criticism of neolinguistics)," *Language* 23 (1947), pp. 344-375.

<sup>10</sup> Karl Vossler, *Wesenszüge romanischer Sprache und Dichtung* (München: Piper, 1946), p. 42.

<sup>11</sup> Walther von Wartburg, *Einführung in die Problematik und Methodik der Sprachwissenschaft* (Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1943), especially Chap. IV.



modified phonemic system (pp. 73-74). However, there are many examples where no easier articulation characterizes the result of a sound change so that no conditioned allophones can be assumed as preceding the change. Such is the case of depalatalization of fricative consonants in Spanish, or the palatalization of Czech /r/ > /ř/ and Latin /ka/ > /ča/, the latter only in certain Gallo-Romanic regions. This would point to the existence of "laws" outside of the system of purposeful structure, ones which are based on other than contrastive structural means of change, e. g. on purely phonetic or social linguistic or individual creative reasons. Here of course all principal ways of linguistic investigation complement each other to convey the complete picture of sound change. Excessive reliance on any single one distorts that picture.

The author's aim is to present change and reconstruction of languages as conceived by structural linguistics. His ability to fulfill that undertaking is increased by his competence — not too common among structural linguists — in different areas of the Indo-European field, especially in the languages best attested historically and for a long uninterrupted period of time, such as the Greek and Italic branches. On the other hand, it remains to be seen how the procedures expounded will work, especially in their details, when applied to other Indo-European, such as Slavic, or to non-Indo-European linguistic fields.

The chief value of this book is in presenting a systematic and complete treatment of the methods and results of descriptive structural linguistic science reevaluated and organized for use in historical linguistics. Until now only unrelated partial studies in this field have been available, generally suitable more for use by the descriptive than the historical and comparative linguist. There is another value in Hoenigswald's work, not less important than the one mentioned above — it fulfills the need for synthesizing so greatly missed in modern American linguistics. *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction* is a book to become a vademecum of every linguistic scholar interested in applying methods of science to the study of history and relationship of languages.

University of Southern California

VLADIMÍR HONSA

**Alvin Kernan, *The Cankered Muse. Satire of the English Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959. x + 261 pp. \$5.00. Yale Studies in English, 142).** THIS book is concerned in part with the characteristics of satire in general, and in part with the examination of certain satires of the Renaissance period, chiefly the dramatic satires of John Marston. The opening chapters, which survey a variety of satiric theory and practice, arose, we are told, from the study of these plays. From them, the author was led to an investigation of Elizabethan theories of satire, and concluded that the work of Marston and his contemporaries poses in a particular form the problem of comprehension which all satire presents, and for which a complete theory of the genre is necessary. The Elizabethan tradition does not in itself yield such a comprehensive theory, but it is experimental and adventurous, and it recognises, as Mr. Kernan's examination shows, the special problems of strategy raised by this difficult form.

The most immediate purpose of Mr. Kernan's book is to show the distinction in Elizabethan practice between satirist and author, a distinction which supports his 'basic contention: that satire is not a form of biography or social history but an artistic construct, the parts of which—scene, satirist, and plot—are to be understood in terms of their function in the satiric poem.' More specifically, it is argued that 'despite variations resulting from changes in ethos and differences in particulars, the basic components of satire, scene, satirist, and plot remain fairly constant in all ages because they are always the expression of an unchanging sense of life.' Of these two statements, it is perhaps the second which is at present more interesting and important. The close attention which has been paid to the techniques of Augustan satire has predisposed us to recognize sophistications of method in the satiric writings of the preceding age, and one may doubt whether it is now necessary to argue at much length the position that a satiric poem or play is a work of art like any other, and that the figure which gives voice to satiric comment differs to a greater or less degree from the actual author, who has created that figure for his own exact purposes. None the less, Mr. Kernan's treatment of individual works, in particular those of Jonson and Marston, shows that the assumption which has proved so rewarding in the case of Augustan satire is equally rewarding here.

The second of the two related statements has been less extensively treated, and some interesting possibilities emerge from Mr. Kernan's

comparison of Renaissance practice with that of the classical and mediaeval periods. Essential similarities exist, it is suggested, between the satiric methods of all ages, since the satirist will at all times be bent upon expressing a vision of life which survives with remarkably little change despite changing outer circumstances, and whose embodiment in words must involve similar problems and similar solutions. The satirist has always tended to see the evils of life in roughly the same terms; his vision is likely to be concerned with the easy descent of humanity to the animal, the mindlessness which may be expressed in the libertinism of Juvenal's Rome, in the sheeplike acceptance of Orwell's animal world, in the stifling materialism of Jonson's London or the distorted physical phenomena of Pope's. To quote Miss Leyburn's phrase in her *Satiric Allegory. Mirror of Man*, the satirist's aim is "to quicken in some way man's sense of himself as man," and what reduces man's stature is a lack of awareness which puts him at the mercy of his environment as completely as is an animal or a machine. The world of satire is often one of animality or of mechanism, and so the satirist has to face in a special and accentuated form the problem of artistic order. He must present an atmosphere of confused viciousness and stupidity, and yet without disturbing the chaotic material on which he depends he must relate it to order and to the meaning it does not in itself possess; the mindless world must be not only expressed but placed, set in relation to values beyond its recognition. To achieve this, satirist after satirist has found that a 'persona' or 'mask' figure, however slightly developed, is indispensable. By its interaction with such a figure the disorderly material of satire can be used as one element in a larger order, for the persona can comment on it, can enter into it and fare well or ill, can even be commented on in his turn through ironic implication. The relationship between persona and satiric scene is vital to satire which is to reach any degree of complication, and to present a vision of life rather than mere vituperation.

The Elizabethans were very conscious of the importance of the satiric persona, and in the dramatic satires, some of which Mr. Kernan analyses from this point of view, the relation of the persona and the satiric material has its own acute problems. In the satirist characters of Jonson and Marston, participators in the play's action who themselves adopt a disguise as malcontents or melancholics, awareness of the function of the satiric mask reaches a point of high sophistication. But it was the satirists of a later period who, inheriting from their

predecessors the problem of relationship and the spirited attempts at a solution, made the most exact use of the persona; and it would be interesting to see the treatment of this omnipresent figure carried forward into our greatest satiric age. Recurring details of characterisation, such as the presentation of the satirist as a disappointed idealist in Timon's manner, or as a man who, in striving to outgo humanity, becomes less than human and is absorbed into the world he condemns, might be more authoritatively considered by reference to the precisely organized satires of Swift and of Pope, and the reasons why such techniques were found so useful as to become part of a conscious artistic tradition might thus be more fully explored. The study, dealing as it does both with a general survey of English Renaissance and pre-Renaissance satire, and with a critical examination of certain particular works, can not supply a complete treatment of the genre, nor does it aim to do so. In practice, although the reader may sometimes wish that the book's plan had allowed more expanded discussion of a particular point, the interplay between the general and the detailed can be very suggestive, as for example in the handling of the theory of the satirist as satyr, and its effect upon the development of the satiric persona. Moreover Mr. Kernan, like the satirists themselves, keeps his attention fixed upon 'the primary relation of satire to its goal, not its author,' and so can discuss with relevance and point the special methods which the resourceful Renaissance mind recognised as necessary for that 'form of poetry made up of interlocking symbolic parts' which good satire should be.

University of South Wales,  
Cardiff

KATHLEEN WILLIAMS

**G. M. Story and Helen Gardner, *The Sonnets of William Alabaster* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959. liv + 65 pp. \$2.90. Oxford English Monographs, 7).** WILLIAM Alabaster (1568-1640) has probably been known to most of us through Miss Guiney's publication of five of his sonnets, along with a compact biography, in her *Recusant Poets* of 1938. The present edition at last brings before us all the known sonnets of Alabaster (77 of them, plus two doubtful attributions), with an informative general introduction by Mr. Story, a joint textual introduction, and a very helpful commentary on the poems by Miss Gardner. It is a learned, perceptive, and generous treatment

of a significant minor poet, and the Oxford Press has also done its part well by designing a very attractive volume.

Alabaster's notorious oscillations between the English and the Roman churches show him as a remarkably unstable and somewhat reprehensible character, displaying in extreme form the religious tensions of the time. The crucial period for his poetry seems to have come in 1597-8, when he gave up a promising career in the English church, announced his conversion to Roman Catholicism, and "made up his mind to enter the Society" of Jesus, according to the underground Jesuit, John Gerard, who guided Alabaster in performing the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola. Actually, Alabaster never entered into Roman orders, and he ultimately returned to service in the English church; but his violent and painful conversion to Romanism led him to express his problems in religious poetry that clearly illustrates the impact of Counter-Reformation methods of devotion upon the spirituality of Elizabethan England.

Mr. Story stresses the continuity of English devotional traditions in the 16th century, and rightly so, for remnants of the old religion provided the ground upon which the influence of continental Catholicism could work. At the same time he senses in Sonnet 15 a representation of the Ignatian mode of meditation by the "three powers of the soul" — memory, understanding, and will:

So moves my love about the heavenly sphere,  
And draweth thence with an attractive fire  
The purest argument wit can desire,  
Whereby devotion after may arise.  
And these conceits, digest by thoughts' retire,  
Are turned into april showers of tears.

The process described in this sonnet, he says, "is the immemorial method of Christian meditation; yet it is so with a difference. For one thing the sonnet form in which the meditation is cast belongs to the sixteenth century, and for another the temper of the verse is new. It is a metaphysical poem." But the method of meditation here described is not an immemorial one: the components were inherent in the whole history of Christian devotion, but the concentrated practice of this precise method, as in the Jesuit exercises, represented a recent development. The temper of Alabaster's verse is new because a new mode of religious apprehension lies within it and behind it: the meditative mode of the late sixteenth century. Mr. Story comes close to making this point a little later, when he notes that Alabaster

"is a different *kind* of poet" from Constable or Barnes in their religious sonnets. The difference in kind is well represented in the title that the editors have chosen for Alabaster's sonnets, following a manuscript reported by Collier: *Divine Meditations*. The title, as readers of Miss Gardner's definitive edition of Donne will realize, is the same as the title given in some manuscripts to Donne's Holy Sonnets. The collocation is right, for both sets of sonnets spring from the same spiritual discipline.

Thus Alabaster's sonnets often open with an imaginative "composition," where the speaker makes himself vividly present at some scene in the life of Christ: "Alas, our shepherd now is struck again, / See how the silly flock away doth hie"; "Behold a conduit that from heaven doth run, / And at Christ's side a double stream doth vent";

When without tears I look on Christ, I see  
Only a story of some passion,  
Which any common eye may wonder on;  
But if I look through tears Christ smiles on me.

Or we may have another kind of composition, performed by creating some "similitude": "His death begins within a farm, within / The farm of Jewry"; "My soul within the bed of heaven doth grow"; "My soul a world is by contraction." Or at other times we have the simple proposing of a problem for meditation: "What meaneth this, that Christ an hymn did sing"; "When all forsake, whose courage dare abide?" And we have, of course, the frequent colloquies, sometimes with the self ("Sink down, my soul, into the lowest cell"), more often with Christ: "Jesu, thy love within me is so main"; "Lo here I am, lord, whither wilt thou send me?"

Beyond these dramatic openings, a more significant kinship with Donne may be found in the steady presence, throughout Alabaster's sonnets, of that "intellectual, argumentative evolution" long ago pointed out by Grierson as a prime quality of Donne's poetry. This development in Alabaster's sonnets is inseparable from the process of formal meditation. Sometimes, as in a few of Donne's Holy Sonnets, we can see the whole process of a meditation recapitulated. Thus in Alabaster's third sonnet we have first the presentation of place, combined with a memory of the Old Testament "type":

Over the brook of Cedron Christ is gone,  
To entertain the combat with his death,  
Where David fled beforetime void of breath,  
To scape the treacheries of Absalom.



Then follows the intellectual analysis, developing the brook into a conceit:

Go let us follow him in passion,  
Over this brook, this world that walloweth,  
A stream of cares that drown our thoughts beneath,  
And wash away all resolution:  
Beyond the world he must be passed clear,  
That in the world for Christ will troubles bear.

Finally, we have the expression of "affections," the direction of the will, expressed in a colloquy of self-address and a plea to Christ:

Leave we, O leave we then this miry flood,  
Friends, pleasures, and unfaithful good.  
Now we are up, now down, but cannot stand,  
We sink, we reel, Jesu stretch forth thy hand.

This is pedestrian enough, a sample of Alabaster in his weaker moments; but here in rudimentary form we can, I think, see the process of mind that dominates most of the sonnets: the deliberate evocation of the spirit of devotion through the use of analysed images.

The better sonnets rise to higher levels through a more complex dramatization, where the speaker not only addresses himself, but projects a certain aspect of himself upon the scene, and there subjects that part of himself to sustained analysis and judgment. One of the best examples of this higher level of achievement is found in sonnet 33, "Ego Sum Vitis," where lust is turned to spiritual love through the interposition of the Vine upon the Cross:

Now that the midday heat doth scorch my shame  
With lightning of fond lust, I will retire  
Under this vine whose arms with wandering spire  
Do climb upon the Cross, and on the same  
Devise a cool repose from lawless flame,  
Whose leaves are intertwist with love entire,  
That envy's eye cannot transfuse her fire,  
But is rebated on the shady frame;  
And youthful vigour from the leaved tier,  
Doth stream upon my soul a new desire.  
List, list, the ditties of sublimed fame,  
Which in the closet of those leaves the choir  
Of heavenly birds do warble to his name.  
O where was I that was not where I am?

The powers of the soul are here so thoroughly wrought together that the poem presents one sustained movement from the graphic composi-

tion of place to the paradoxical realization of the will. It is a poem that, despite a certain ruggedness of phrasing, would not disgrace the works of Herbert or Vaughan. And it is not an isolated excellence: at least twenty of Alabaster's sonnets can equal or surpass this poem, and twenty more rise beyond mere competence. Alabaster, though often clumsy and excessively intellectual, is a true poet; the body of his work here represents much more than a footnote to the history of English literature.

As the above quotations show, the editors have found it necessary to present Alabaster's sonnets in modernized form; they explain that erratic spelling and punctuation in the manuscripts would otherwise have produced an almost unreadable text. The procedure seems justified under the circumstances. But other aspects of editorial policy seem more debatable. The two chief manuscripts, those in St. John's College, Cambridge, and in the Bodleian, have 41 sonnets in common, and these "appear in the same order in both manuscripts with the single exception" of one sonnet. The third important manuscript, that in Oscott College, contains thirteen sonnets, nine of them unique. The editors have provided a table from which one can reconstruct the order of the sonnets as they appear in each of these three manuscripts; there is no doubt that the editors are right in saying that the sonnets often clearly fall into groups or sequences. Yet at the same time there are certain sonnets which appear to break any consistent arrangement. As Mr. Story says, "The problem, then, is whether to follow the order of the manuscripts or to remove the personal sonnet and place it with others of the same kind, letting the fifteen sonnets on the Incarnation come together as a group." Or again, in regard to the Oscott manuscript: "Is an editor to preserve the order of the two main manuscripts and add the sonnets preserved in *O* at the end, or should he bring together and arrange in a reasonable order all the sonnets Alabaster wrote on the Passion and its emblems?" The editors have chosen to rearrange, in the belief that the "editor's task is to try to reconstruct the form in which the poet would have arranged his work if he had presented it to the general public."

The difficulty is that what seems reasonable to one reader may not seem so to another. For example, Sonnet 21 in this edition is the first sonnet in the Oscott manuscript; the editors group it with other sonnets apparently dealing with the Resurrection, because its heading refers to Christ's address to Mary in the garden of the Sepulchre. This sonnet, Mr. Story says, "is in no sense introductory in nature,

and has nothing to do with the Crucifixion theme of the poems in *O* which follow it." But as I would read this sonnet, it seems in every sense introductory, and has everything to do with the theme of the Crucifixion: it is a lament for the loss of "Christ's presence" and an effort to recover that presence through tears. Meditation on the Cross is the traditional mode of recovering a sense of Christ's presence. Moreover, the imagery of the closing lines of Sonnet 21 ("And beams reflect upon my rainbow's dew") seems to provide a link with the opening of the second sonnet in the Oscott manuscript, which here appears as Sonnet 30:

Before thy Cross, O Christ, I do present  
My soul and body into love distilled,  
As dewy clouds with equal moisture filled  
Receive the tincture of the rainbow bent;

A similar problem occurs with Sonnet 24, which bears the heading "Upon the Ensigns of Christ's Crucifying" in the Bodleian manuscript. The three sonnets that immediately follow in both major manuscripts are on quite different subjects. The editors therefore remove these following sonnets to a later position, and place the sonnet on the "ensigns" at the head of an arranged group of poems on various aspects of the Passion, giving the title of this sonnet to the whole group, and adding an editorial title, "The Sponge," for Sonnet 24. But Sonnet 24 does not appear to be a meditation on the sponge; it looks like a summary meditation on all the "ensigns," as the first line shows: "O sweet and bitter monuments of pain." The "tart sponge of thy Passion" is only one of several vivid images in the close of this remarkably fine poem. The sonnet could as well be taken as the conclusion to a sequence on the Passion — as it seems to appear in the St. John's manuscript.

But except for the doubtful groupings and rearrangements, this edition is admirably done. Variant readings are skillfully chosen and recorded; and the above objections are made possible only by the clarity and fulness of the textual data provided. We are deeply indebted to the editors for giving us a new and valuable poet in the English line of meditative, or metaphysical, poetry.

*Yale University*

LOUIS L. MARTZ

**F. P. Wilson, *Seventeenth Century Prose: Five Lectures* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1960. 120 pp. \$3.00. The Ewing Lectures).**

JUDGING from the astonishing assortment of difficult books now available in paperbacks, either the quality of the general reader has improved immeasurably or his capacities have been underestimated for years. It would seem to be a reasonable assumption that his interests are now best served by treating him as an expert, and subjecting him not only to the fruits but to the rigors of scholarly research. Should this be true, the cause of seventeenth-century prose would be furthered more by a gathering of Professor Croll's essays—a collection long needed—than by Professor Wilson's graceful Ewing Lectures delivered at Berkeley in 1958. The first lecture, "A Survey," makes distinctions between the earlier and later decades of the period, and emphasizes the influence of the Court on the fine raillery of Restoration prose. Professor Wilson then discusses the new literary forms of the essay and the character (properly judged to be new because of the style they were written in), and concludes with speculations on the absence of the real novel in the seventeenth century. There are several very clear echoes of *Elizabethan and Jacobean* in this chapter. The second lecture, "Biography," begins with Roper's life of More and traces, through Harington, Walton, Aubrey, Sprat, Davies, and collections of table-talk, the growing interest in exact biographies of an increasingly heterogeneous variety of men. The third lecture on "The Sermon" distinguishes between the different kinds and styles of this vast genre, from Silver-Tongued Smith to Tillotson. In so far as Professor Wilson has a guiding theme for these talks, it is his belief that "the Jacobean age is distinguished from the Elizabethan in its more exact, more searching, more detailed enquiry into moral and political questions and in its interest in the analysis of the mysteries and perturbations of the human mind." His choice of Robert Burton and Sir Thomas Browne as the subjects for the two essays which complete this volume reveals his own preference for figures who combine the new enthusiasm for enquiry with the old belief in the tradition and unity of knowledge. They combined an academic scholasticism with an interest in contemporary discoveries much in the way that Professor Wilson combines the style and manner of an older generation of English scholars with a knowledge of the most recent publications in American journals. Curious it may be at this date to be reminded of Charles Lamb's opinions of Burton and Browne, but Professor Wilson is not like

one well-known English scholar who discovered ten years late, when her work was in proof, that Richard Foster Jones had written about the seventeenth century—and confirmed her findings.

For those of use who are starting our scholarly careers, *Seventeenth Century Prose* is the kind of book to prompt personal reflection. We know, partly from our reading, partly from the bibliography at the end of last year's *Jacobean Studies*, that Professor Wilson knows far more than we do, or perhaps will ever know, yet the range of information in this book is not beyond the competence of a good graduate student. The surety of presentation and ease of allusion are, of course, another matter. One is not aware of a mind excited by its real or imagined discoveries and eager to be believed, but rather is one impressed by the final modesty achieved after years of long reading—a willingness to forego the pleasures of putting forward new theories and challenging old ones, in order to recreate for a wider audience the simple pleasure of reading ancient authors. All the vanities involved in being "original," and impressing one's colleagues by the subtlety of one's observation have been forgotten; what is left is a desire, not to popularize in the bad sense, but to bring scholarship out of the library and the professional journal into the huge auditorium. If this is not a vanity, however, it may still be an illusion, the last infirmity of learned minds. The seventeenth century is nothing if not complex, and the general reader who is not prepared to encounter the difficulties with at least a semblance of professional interest had better stay away. Such works as George Williamson's *The Senecan Amble* or Howard Schultz's *Milton and Forbidden Knowledge* may be too compressed for any general reader one may care to postulate, but William Haller's *The Rise of Puritanism* and Perry Miller's *The New England Mind* are studies of seventeenth-century prose which, it seems to me, not only satisfy the specialists but may serve as examples of what the general reader could be expected to enjoy too.

The visiting lecturer from England in this country is faced with notorious difficulties in meeting audiences composed indiscriminately of undergraduates, graduate students, and professional scholars. Professor Wilson has probably come closer than many of his predecessors to pleasing all classes, although it is possible (not certain) that he has underestimated the undergraduate's ability to endure, and even to enjoy, the difficulties of an enquiry not wholly within his comprehension. When we listen to an Elder Statesman we would like to be a

little perplexed, and we expect, as a general rule, the discourse of scholars to be nearer the written than the spoken word. In English literary circles, as the Clark Lectures in recent years have amply demonstrated, criticism is still dominated by the code of the spoken address. Weight is sacrificed to grace, complexity to charm, ponderable conclusions to the balanced appraisal. It is impossible to imagine Professor Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* going over at all as lectures at Oxford. English critics are more aware than they were that the common pursuit is carried on in this country as well, but it appears that the concept of what constitutes a first-rate lecture—or, basically, an exciting critical experience—is still very different in the two countries. If, as lectures, these essays successfully illuminated a difficult subject for a wide audience, as a book, though not diminishing one's great esteem for Professor Wilson, they are unlikely to widen greatly the appreciation of seventeenth-century prose.

Cornell University

JOHN M. WALLACE

**Bonamy Dobrée, *English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century 1700-1740* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959. xii + 701 pp. \$10.00. The Oxford History of English Literature, 7).** PROFESSOR Dobrée's survey of the literature of the early eighteenth century, the seventh volume of the *Oxford History of English Literature*, has been made according to a firmly conceived plan. As the author remarks at once, "there is no general agreement as to how, or to what end, a history of literature should be written," but his own aim has been to provide a reference book of comprehensive scope "for the inquiring student and the interested general reader, rather than for the expert," and his choice of content and arrangement has been guided by his intention to "make the reader free of the realm here treated of."

Of the various plans which a history of literature may be written, this is surely one of the most acceptable, and Professor Dobrée has carried it out with practicality and skill. The inquiring student is well served by the chronological table covering public events as well as literary ones, and by a well-planned bibliography which deals both with individual authors and with topics ranging from History and Science to Travel and Printing and Publishing. With this volume to hand, the student can gain a general picture of the period and can set himself on the way to follow up particular interests; he will be



aware of the best editions to use, and for the most part of the results of modern scholarship, for the bibliography is as up-to-date as can be reasonably expected and as full as its aim requires.

The solidity and comprehensiveness aimed at in the apparatus is present throughout the book. There is little that is new, little fresh interpretation of individual works or of the character of the period as a whole; the author's intention clearly is to present not a novel and individual view but a résumé of existing opinion. But if one accepts as legitimate the conception of literary history which has guided the making of this volume, it is perhaps true to say that student and general reader are better served by a conscientious presentation of the existing situation in eighteenth century scholarship than by a provocative individual re-statement of it with which they may not be equipped to deal. Nor is Professor Dobée's presentation merely conscientious; it is zestful and appreciative, and literature, philosophy, science, and the affairs of daily life are brought together into a rich and coherent whole which should absorb and stimulate the readers at whom he aims.

The writing of a history of the literature of any given period must have its own difficulties, but for the Augustan age there are two special problems of organization. One is operative chiefly in the sphere of poetry; there is Pope, and a considerable distance behind there is Thomson, but apart from these two there is a great deal of minor verse; how to select from this material so as to give, within a few chapters, a true and an interesting picture of the age? To a lesser degree, the problem exists also in prose. The works of Swift, Defoe, Addison, can no more be appreciated without a knowledge of the often lively but less distinguished writing from which they sprang than can those of Pope. Again the difficulty is one of selection and emphasis. Secondly, a history of Augustan literature must include a great deal of the sort of material summed up under the title of "background," the arguments of philosophers, theologians, politicians, the developments in scientific thinking and in society in a changing age. Together, these two problems accentuate that difficult decision as to the relating of general and particular which must exist for any historian of literature. Professor Dobrée has dealt with them firmly and for the most part very successfully, by avoiding too rigid an outline and being ready to adjust the arrangement of material to the requirements of his subject. The volume is divided into three parts, devoted to the periods 1700 to 1720, 1700 to 1740, and 1720 to 1740, and the works

of the major authors are dealt with under these headings. In the case of Pope, Defoe, and Swift this means that their long writing careers are divided into two parts, and the two later appear also among the 'controversialists' of Chapter IV. In practice, this arrangement works very well. Detailed chapters like that on Essayist and Controversialists give an excellent impression of the cut-and-thrust of the political world to which much of the greatest writing was tied, and as we move year by year through the rise and fall of the *Examiner*, the *Review*, the *Tatler*, the concerns of the age become increasingly vivid, while at the same time the more ephemeral writing is kept in relation, by an occasional sentence, with *Gulliver's Travels* or *Robinson Crusoe*. The same flexibility is found in the handling of the poetry. Those poets who are worth separate attention are collected (apart from Pope and Thomson) under the heading of "Some Poets," while the rest, who are important only in their use of dominant genres or subjects, are grouped under "Some Forms," "Scientific Verse," or even "Various Trends." Thus the author is able to avoid an anti-climactic arrangement with its parade of a few great writers followed by a depressing trail of the second-rate, and also to place the major figures firmly in the setting of their time. Less familiar letters, diaries, and periodicals are effectively used to give solidity and depth to the presentation of a rich and vigorous period.

It is this thoroughness, fullness, and vividness of treatment which is the great merit of Professor Dobrée's book. The relation of "The Philosophers" to particular works of literature is perhaps a little scantied, but otherwise justice is done to the variety and vitality of the age and to its essential seriousness. Addison and the society of the coffee-houses are not allowed, as so often in the past, to set the tone of an age which included Pope and Swift, Berkeley and Mandeville, and the "unbearable silliness" of some of the *Tatler* and *Spectator* essays is frankly and refreshingly admitted. Writers, like Young or Akenside, who were once accorded over-generous treatment as precursors of a later period are here put in their place, and such good minor poets as Prior, Diaper, and Watts are treated in some detail. There are some emphases with which one may quarrel. John Dennis, for example, with his frequent acuteness of comment and his grasp of the literary issues at stake in his day, might repay a more particularised discussion; Ambrose Philips, many of whose poems, says Professor Dobrée, "are, it must be confessed, silly," might be dismissed in less even than the two pages he is given. But critical

standards are maintained in the marshalling of these lesser figures, and the precision and justice with which the minor poetry is treated make all the more surprising the tentative handling of Pope. The *Moral Essays* are surely underestimated: it is scarcely adequate to dismiss the second epistle in the sentence "The next, on the Character of Women, is, in the main, cheap: we read it now for Atossa," or to present the *Epistle to Bathurst* as a collection of characters and rapid narrative in which the story of Sir Balaam is "no better and no worse than the usual fable of the day." Indeed Professor Dobrée, though he refers to some of the recent criticism which has so much increased our appreciation of the later poetry of Pope, seems much more at ease with the early poems. *An Essay on Man* is given respectful but rather hesitant treatment, and despite a passage of enthusiastic and discriminating praise of the *New Dunciad* the chapter ends on a note of apology for the Pope who "ceased to wander in fancy's maze" and who "seldom touches the deeps of mysticism" which seems hardly necessary in discussing the mature work of one of our greatest poets. On the other hand, the voluminous production of the age's two outstanding prose writers is treated with a precision and a comprehensiveness remarkable in so extensive a survey, and with full appreciation of the depth and complexity of Swift and the variety and "burning imagination" of Defoe. Professor Dobrée is to be congratulated on a book at once so inclusive and so vivid, and so well calculated to "make the reader free" of the realm of Augustan literature.

University of South Wales,  
Cardiff

KATHLEEN WILLIAMS

**Reuben Arthur Brower, *Alexander Pope, The Poetry of Allusion* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959. xi + 368 pp. \$5.60).**

THE task undertaken by Mr. Brower was a formidable one, and if the reach of his book seems occasionally to have exceeded his grasp, one is still bound to be impressed—and often simply delighted—by the range and sensitivity of his discussions of Pope's poetry. There are not many book-length critical studies of Pope's work that can be considered really valuable for students, but *Alexander Pope: The Poetry of Allusion* is a study that one is happy to place alongside such a book as Geoffrey Tillotson's *On the Poetry of Pope*. And it is in the light of this estimation of Mr. Brower's work that any criticism

of his methods, and any disagreement with his interpretations of Pope's poetry, are to be read.

Mr. Brower's book opens with a chapter that expresses a fine compliment to John Dryden and also offers a very perceptive account of the blend of the heroic style and the style of public address in Dryden's best work. From this point on, the book takes up, in roughly chronological fashion, all of the more important poems written by Pope, and, in Mr. Brower's own words, "Very nearly the first half of every chapter or section of the book is given over to Virgil or Homer or Horace, or some other ancient poet and the main tradition associated with his work." These words describe more accurately the plan of the first half of his book, for Chapter VI, entitled "The Image of Horace," is concerned almost solely with the Roman poet's verse (even so, the chapter is one of the best and most interesting portions of the book). After Chapter VI, such a description really no longer applies (by this time, it is true, Mr. Brower can rely on the backgrounds and perspectives he has established in the earlier chapters), for here the chapters no longer begin with discussions of particular ancient poets, but are mainly concerned with the examination of verse texture and movement in *An Essay on Criticism* and in the poems Pope published from 1728 on (*An Essay on Man*, the *Epistles to Several Persons*, the *Imitations of Horace*, and the *Dunciad*).

On the whole, this scheme enables Mr. Brower to build up a rich sense of literary history and values upon which later chapters may draw for support and illustration. There is a steady accumulation of a sense of traditional modes and values which serves to illuminate finely the quality of much of Pope's verse. At the same time, it should be said that the proportion of background material seems on occasion to become either too thick (as in Chapter IV, in the rather heavy discussion of Homer) or too thin (as in Chapters VIII and IX, where too many poems, particularly the *Epistles to Several Persons*, seem to be treated cursorily and rather apart from any allusive background). But surely one of the finest chapters is the last, concerned mainly with the *Dunciad* and *The Temple of Fame*. In the discussions of these poems Mr. Brower seems to utilize supremely well the awareness of poetic traditions and modes he has previously established for the reader.

Any attempt to state clearly both the real achievements and occasional limitations one discovers in Mr. Brower's book must begin, however, with some understanding of what the author means by

"allusion," and of the use he makes of the term. Actually the term as Mr. Brower employs it is not easily summed up in a brief definition. From his preface one learns that "allusion" refers to the way in which Pope "used the poetry of the past for his own expressive purposes," and that for "Dryden and Pope allusion, especially in ironic contexts, is a resource equivalent to symbolic metaphor and elaborate imagery in other poets"; through "allusion, often in combination with subdued metaphor and exquisite images, Pope gets his purchase on larger meanings and evokes the finer resonances by which poetry . . . 'penetrates the recesses of the mind.'" The term even approximates the sense of "imitation" or "translation" as a way of describing Pope's use of ancient modes and traditions. Aside from the definitions suggested in the preface, however, one finds a sense of the term emerging from the critical demonstrations to be found in the book at large. Here one comes to feel that "allusion" is a term used to describe the way in which Pope's verse, through intimate relationship with the poetry of the (mainly classical) past, gains much of its richness of texture, its subtlety of movement, its largeness of dimension.

It would be one thing to carry off a relatively brief discussion (in the compass of an essay, for example) of the role of allusion in a poet's work; it is quite another to sustain a discussion of this dimension of a major poet's work in a book of nearly 400 pages. There are a number of difficulties inherent in such an undertaking, not the least of which is the fact that in itself "allusion" (even as broadly as Mr. Brower's practice defines the term) may no more "explain" a poem than may a discussion of a scatter of special metrical patterns. If an exploration of the role of allusion is to be something more than an investigation of brilliant local effects, the allusions must finally be related to a structure of meaning discoverable in a poem as a whole. Mr. Brower knows this, and seems to set as one of his aims the interpretation and evaluation of almost every important poem written by Pope. But it is just here (even amidst awareness of the way in which Mr. Brower sharpens our sense of the wonders of Pope's verse) that a distinction in regards to his achievement should be stated: Mr. Brower is marvelously perceptive in his discussions of *portions* of Pope poems—of what might be described as the texture and movement and dimensions of any particular *passage* of poetry with which he deals; he is only occasionally successful, in the opinion of this reader, in his attempts (often the attempt seems not even to be made) to deal



with the larger designs of meaning—indeed the “whole meanings”—of individual poems.

In order that this distinction be better understood, and also that it not appear that the author's task is being arbitrarily defined for him, the following passage from his preface should be cited: “In the chapters that follow, my first and last concern is with the poems, with their poetic character and design.” If this concern were not so emphatically stated, in the preface as well as elsewhere in the book, one would be less inclined to challenge Mr. Brower on the issue. As it is, it seems important to insist here that it is not often that he gives us a sense of what might be called either the “larger designs” or the “inner structure of event and meaning” in entire poems. “Design,” as Pope used the term, is perhaps a bit ambiguous: it may refer to the purpose—what might be called the “purport”—of a poem, or to its total structure or plan of meaning. In any event, it is in his failure to demonstrate fully or to explore adequately the structures of meaning in whole poems that one finds the chief limitation in Mr. Brower's discussions of Pope's poetry. Perhaps the problem can be presented by way of another set of terms used by Mr. Brower. Several times he makes a distinction between what a poem *says* and what it *expresses*, and he is emphatically on the side of *expression*. Of course one understands what he means here (even though the distinction may finally appear rather tenuous and artificial), but there are times when a reader might be made a little happier with his judgments if it were more certain that Mr. Brower actually knew what a poem was saying, or how it was designed.

This weakness of the book is felt mainly in Chapters VIII and IX, in the often skimpy discussions of the *Epistles to Several Persons* and of the *Imitations of Horace*, but it is also a limitation felt throughout the book. This weakness may be illustrated by the treatment accorded Pope's imitation of Horace's *Second Epistle of the Second Book*. Mr. Brower admires the Horatian original greatly, and though he concedes excellence to Pope's lines on the guardianship of language, it is still obvious in the three or four pages allotted to Pope's poem (pages filled mainly with verse quotations) that he has no time for the “design” or metaphoric structure of the imitation. There is no mention of what is perhaps the most significant or “key” change Pope made when he adapted the circumstances of the Horatian original: in Horace the youth offered for sale at the beginning of the poem has one principal fault—he plays truant; in Pope the youth



is a thief. This change introduces us to the controlling metaphor of Pope's poem—thievery—and ultimately to a concern with the greatest thief of all, "This subtle Thief of Life, this paltry Time." One cannot discuss the "inner seriousness" of Pope's poem versus that of Horace if one does not in some way discuss the way in which this metaphor controls the events and developments of the imitation and finally culminates in Pope's version of "Ripeness is all":

Has Age but melted the rough parts away,  
As Winter-fruits grow mild e'er they decay?

If one believes, as this reader does, that Pope's version of this Horatian epistle is one of the most skillful, as well as one of the most moving, poems Pope ever wrote, then such summary treatment as Mr. Brower accords it as an "allusion" to Horace seems a bit inadequate. And if one believes that Pope provided his imitation with its own new integrity, then it is not enough to dismiss portions of it with the statement that they are "hardly 'out of Horace.'" Such a statement turns "allusion," as a critical principle, into a rather blunt instrument.

For an example of a different way in which Mr. Brower's approach seems limited, one may take his discussion of Pope's *Messiah*. He introduces this poem with the statement that Pope translated "the *Pollio* in terms of Isaiah," and says that at least that was Pope's "intention," but that "the result often seems to illustrate the reverse process." Actually, it is Mr. Brower who seems to have things in reverse, as the title of Pope's poem, and also its substance, both indicate. The original title of *Messiah* as it appeared in the *Spectator* was "Messiah. A sacred Eclogue, compos'd of several Passages of Isaiah the Prophet. Written in Imitation of Virgil's *Pollio*." In other words, Pope is rendering the *substance* of Isaiah in the *manner* of Virgil (though "manner" here must be a very relative term), and this was not only his intention but the fact of his poem. For though Pope may have utilized important elements of the *Pollio*, his poem is certainly in the main a tissue of passages drawn from throughout the Book of Isaiah.

Mr. Brower dissents from Norman Ault's view that the imagery of *Messiah* is drawn from the Douai Version of the Bible, saying that he can find only one parallel to the Douai text. In fact, Pope used both the Authorized Version and the Douai Version, and there are numerous indications of this. (Thus the word "dewy" in l. 13 suggests DV rather than AV; l. 56 recalls DV's "Father of the world to come" rather than AV's "everlasting Father," and Gilbert Wake-

field noted that Pope's "good sense led him to correct . . . the monstrous absurdity of our common translation at this passage of *Isaiah*"; l. 61 recalls the "siethes" of DV (Is., 2:4) rather than AV's "pruning-hooks." This list could be expanded further.)

But the main objection to Mr. Brower's treatment of *Messiah* springs from his estimate of the poem as little more than a "good show." He does not mention the structural development of the poem, its division into sequences marked off by Alexandrines. He praises Virgil's *Pollio* when its "Facts give way to miracle, even to absurdity," but does not note the same joyous occurrences in *Messiah*—and thus seems to miss the sublime and tender playfulness of Pope's poem. The impression one is left with is that *Messiah* is so measured against Virgil and *Isaiah* that it is never examined in its own terms. The new couplet procedures used in the poem, the disposition of its parts, the force of its epithets—none of these elements is considered in this "allusion" to Virgil and to *Isaiah*.

There are other procedures and assessments in the discussions of whole poems that appear open to question, but it seems enough to indicate here only the general manner in which one might disagree with Mr. Brower's efforts. All that might be added here is some indication of the ways in which one may occasionally question some of the details of his interpretations. In his treatment of *Windsor-Forest*, for example, he says that Pope as a historian "is at times amusingly inaccurate and inconsistent, as in his account of William I and his successors." The remark seems so critically out of place because Mr. Brower does not mention the historical myth which had grown up about William the Conqueror and his sons. Pope was working within the contemporary mythical view (not in terms of historical accuracy) of William, the view which held that William's fate, and that of his sons, was part of a plan of divine vengeance: he who lives by the sword is shown to die by the sword. In terms of the myth, William died like a hunted animal in the Forest he had wrested from the Church for the establishment of a hunting preserve. And as an example of an occasion when a central "allusion" might have rounded off one of the discussions of a particular passage, one may note that the passage from *Windsor-Forest* (ll. 211-18) containing these lines,

The watry Landskip of the pendant Woods,  
And absent Trees that tremble in the Floods,

seems directly inspired by a passage from *Mosella* (ll. 189 ff.), by Ausonius, which includes these lines:

tota natant crispis iuga motibus et tremit absens  
pampinus et vitreis vindemia turget in undis.

Whatever the force of these criticisms of Mr. Brower's work, it should be understood that the estimation of his book made at the beginning of this review still stands. *Alexander Pope: The Poetry of Allusion* is on the whole a fine and valuable book. The learning and discrimination brought to bear on Pope's poetry will be immediately evident to any reader, and the book offers innumerable observations of the kind to which every bosom will return an echo of assent. There seem to be occasions for disagreement with Mr. Brower, but these occasions do not spoil one's pleasure in a stimulating addition to the criticism of Pope's poetry.

*The Rice University*

AUBREY WILLIAMS

**George M. Ridenour, *The Style of Don Juan* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1960. xviii + 168 pp. \$3.00. Yale Studies in English, 144).** THE appearance of the *Variorum Edition* of *Don Juan* in 1957 called attention to the rich and hitherto more or less ignored potentialities to be realized through a study of the style of the poem. In his admirable introduction, Mr. Steffan explored a number of these potentialities; in particular, through an examination of manuscript revisions and variants he showed how deliberate and expert a craftsman Byron was and laid to rest the old critical wheeze that there was very little, if anything, to be said for Byron as artist. Now comes Mr. Ridenour with what we may hope is the first of a number of independent studies to examine in detail particular aspects of the style of *Don Juan*.

Mr. Ridenour finds three great unifying devices in the poem: a metaphor of styles, a metaphor of the Fall, and the interaction of *persona* and protagonist. The first he isolates through a detailed analysis of the Dedication, which he defines as an elaborately traditional satire in the Augustan manner. The organizing metaphor which emerges in the attack on Southey and Castlereagh is one of soaring and falling. Southey and the "Lakers" aspire to soar in pretentious epic flights and fall disastrously. Byron in contrast is content with "pedestrian muses" and writes "simple honest verse." But when truth demands he rises to heroic heights as in the attack on Castlereagh, descending again afterwards into the plain style of

the blunt honest man. This sets the tone and the structural principle followed throughout the poem.

Another important means of organizing the apparently contradictory elements of the poem Mr. Ridenour believes is the Christian doctrine of the Fall. He argues that Byron uses it as a metaphor to express his own personal vision. With this as his frame of reference, he examines Byron's paradoxical treatment of nature, art and love. In the world of *Don Juan* nature is fallen and stands in need of redemption. But it is also a norm against which a corrupt civilization may be exposed. Similarly, the arts of civilization are on the one hand emblems of man's degeneration from an original paradisaical state; on the other hand, they are means by which the fallen world is made bearable and ultimately can be triumphed over.

Mr. Ridenour devotes a separate chapter to Byron's treatment of love. At the outset, over a third of the chapter is devoted to a close analysis of a relatively unfamiliar poem attributed to Byron and first printed in 1901, "Ode to a Lady whose Lover was killed by a ball, which at the same time shivered a Portrait next his Heart." Mr. Ridenour justifies his preoccupation with this poem on the grounds that it sets in sharp relief all the attitudes toward love exhibited in the cantos. But the truth is that he cannot resist the opportunities it provides for a showy explication. As he says, it is a curiously metaphysical piece, and he analyses it as he would a poem by Donne. But it is hardly worth the attention he gives it, which inevitably throws his chapter out of proportion. At the same time, it brings into focus a fundamental limitation in his interpretation of *Don Juan*. He would dearly like to impose upon the poem a tidy pattern of metaphysical paradoxes, but it simply cannot be done. Byron is no "metaphysical" poet. His poem is both more complex and more confused than Mr. Ridenour would allow. Byron's obsession with the imagery of the fall is evident, but one's view of the poem becomes seriously distorted unless the theological imagery is set in counterpoint to the dominant imagery of scepticism which frames and absorbs it.

The world of *Don Juan* is the world of nineteenth century speculation in which all traditional values are seen as inadequate or erroneous. In one sense, *Don Juan* is a constant questioning of cosmic purpose and therefore of the doctrine of the Fall. Often when Byron uses the imagery of the Fall, it is to indicate the vulnerability and insignificance of man in the universal scheme of things. In Byron's eyes man and his world are not so much fallen as low to begin with. He uses

the metaphor with relation less to a fall from some state of perfection than to the gulf between what we aspire or pretend to and what we are (and thus it frequently becomes a flippant or ironic comment on the Christian view of the Fall). In general, he uses the image of a fall because it comes casually to hand and is easily adapted to a wide variety of experiences; insofar as it is an organizing principle in the poem, the theological metaphor is only one and not the most important level of meaning.

In the final two chapters Mr. Ridenour gets back to firmer ground. He returns to the subject of his opening chapter and takes up in more detail the ways in which Byron set about making *Don Juan* a "real" epic. In this regard he finds Byron's metaphor of the voyage of exploration (XIV. 101-102) significant. The poem is a voyage, a search for truth into the heart of social man — the intent of the poet being "to show things as they really are." Mr. Ridenour's most interesting comments here are in relation to the role of the *persona* as Byron develops him. He is middle-aged, disillusioned, weary — looking back nostalgically upon lost youth and innocence. He insists upon his sophistication and worldliness and assumes a tone of detachment. He presents the poem "as the observation of a man who is able to offer impressive evidence of his objectivity and first hand knowledge." And as the poem develops the emphasis is less on what has been lost than on what has been gained — experience becomes a means of arriving at something that may be called truth. At the beginning of the poem there is an enormous gap between speaker and protagonist: "One way of defining the action of *Don Juan* would be to say that it consists of a process of gradually narrowing the gap. . . . For if Juan falls from innocence, in the course of the poem he rises to the level of the speaker." And in this Mr. Ridenour finds his third unifying device.

In his last chapter Mr. Ridenour examines some of the rhetorical and technical devices by which Byron gives to the poem its peculiar style and tone. His examples reinforce Mr. Steffan's in demonstrating how little of the poem's effect is accidental, how much the result of deliberate and skillful manipulation. He glances at the various ways in which Byron handles the stanza form, exploits tension between the retarding pull of the stanza and the conversational flow, sets up remarkable rhythmic and sound patterns, juggles such devices as alliteration, assonance and internal rhyme, and above all engages in a perpetual display of glittering and ingenious word-play.

Mr. Ridenour has written a useful and provocative little book. His thesis that clearly analysable unifying principles may be discerned in the poem is worth emphasizing and demonstrating in order to repudiate once and for all the still wide-spread assumption that Byron is to be dismissed at his word when he implies that in writing the poem he does nothing more than rattle on haphazardly and carelessly as "in a ride or walk." In reaction, perhaps, against those who have taken the poem too lightly Mr. Ridenour tends to take it too seriously. He justifies this by saying his purposes have "prescribed a certain sobriety." Granted that they have, his style nevertheless tends to be overly stiff and proper, a little too solemn for the poem he treats. He admits also that "if taken seriously *Don Juan* is not an entirely comfortable poem," and one senses that he never feels quite at ease with it. He can't really bring himself to approve of it, though he makes a strenuous effort to keep his ethical disapproval out of his examination of the poem. In the preface, however, he says that what he must perceive finally in the poem is a sophistication "we have already too much of. *Don Juan* is, I think, a beautiful, exciting, touching, and rather terrifying vision of a personal and cultural dead end." Inevitably this attitude severely restricts him in his treatment of the poem. There is too much about the Fall, too little about the zest for life of the *persona*. And because of the self-imposed limits of the study large portions of the poem are barely touched upon — the English cantos, for example. But to demand that Mr. Ridenour should have done more than he set himself is unfair; it is enough that he has demonstrated how profitable the study of the style of *Don Juan* can be.

University of Washington

EDWARD E. BOSTETTER

**Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux, *Le Paysan parvenu*, ed. Frédéric Deloffre (Paris: Garnier, 1959. LXXXVI + 468 pp. 8 plates. Classiques Garnier).** THE editor of this novel is a professor at the University of Lyons, and has already given to the Garnier collection Marivaux's *Vie de Marianne*. In the present edition he has achieved a scholarly presentation that offers the Van Loo portrait of Marivaux, an excellent 25 page introduction, a study of the spurious sequels, a collection of eighteenth-century critical opinions of the novel, a bibliography of editions, of translations, of studies of



the author, and the chronology of his life. There are eight reproductions of contemporary illustrations, and several facsimiles of early title pages. The text of this picaresque story of a peasant on the make includes the first five parts (1734-35) unquestionably written by Marivaux, as well as the subsequent doubtful three parts included in the 1756 edition published at The Hague. Added after the text is an analytical table (*âmes, honneur, vertu* with page references) used in a Paris edition of 1748, showing how Marivaux wanted to stress the moral aspects of his work. The edition ends with a glossary explaining eighteenth-century usage (e. g., "faire l'amour à une fille, en style bourgeois, c'est la rechercher en mariage").

The editor in his Introduction shows how for nigh two centuries the *Vie de Marianne* was the more appreciated of the two novels, but today the *Paysan parvenu* is considered the superior work. Faulty editions of the latter are partly to blame as well as Marivaux's method of alternating work at different productions. This habit may help to explain why he abandoned his *Paysan* after the fifth instalment. The parvenu had arrived, was married and settled with the picaresque career merging into assured comfort. Deloffre also compares this novel with other Gallic works of the period as well as those of Fielding, who admired our French author. He traces its genesis through previous writings of Marivaux. The contrast with *Gil Blas* is well defined. The hero Jacob emerges as a man of some principle despite his taking advantage of women to promote his interests. The editor indicates possible auto-biographical elements and some sociological aspects of *Le Paysan parvenu*. The contrast between the moral Marivaux and Laclos is sketched, the former stressing clearly the "condition" so dear to Diderot. The Spanish fiction used by Lesage (who had never seen Spain), and nursed through twenty years of labor over *Gil Blas*, gives place to a concrete French realism compressed into one year of creative effort.

In the Bibliography it is interesting to note that the only complete first edition is at Dijon, and that our Congressional Library has an almost complete edition of 1735.

From Deloffre's study it appears that Marivaux is entitled to a nobler place among original authors of the eighteenth century. He keeps in mind development of character and reduces the number of fantastic adventures sewn into the central action by almost all the other novelists, both English and French, of this time. There is more realism, Marianne is a definite woman, not a mere portrait of a type,

and Jacob begins as a country rustic, shrewd, patient, uncouth, learning to use the vices of others as rungs in his ladder to success. This lackey, like Lesage's Frontin, is bound to end up as a *fermier général*, moving about in the materialistic, egotistical world of Paris. Professor Deloffre has done well by our author, for he stimulates us into a deeper appreciation of Marivaux as a restless creative spirit at work in the field of fiction.

C. W. Post College

HARRY KURZ

**Maurice Regard, *Sainte-Beuve* (Paris: Hatier, 1959. 224 pp. *Connaissance des Lettres*, 54).** M. REGARD, professeur de Lettres à l'université d'Alger vient d'enrichir la collection *Connaissance des Lettres* d'un excellent volume sur Sainte-Beuve. La vie d'un grand écrivain se distingue malaisément de son oeuvre. Il est donc souhaitable de ne pas traiter celle-ci séparément de celle-là. M. Regard l'a compris et son étude se déroule tout simplement dans l'ordre chronologique. Une première partie est consacrée aux antécédents familiaux de Sainte-Beuve et à son enfance boulonnaise. Viennent ensuite, dans une seconde partie, les années romantiques qui nous apportent l'oeuvre poétique et romanesque, aussi bien qu'une première critique inspirée par les idées du Cénacle. Une troisième partie nous fait passer: "d'un exil à l'autre," c'est-à-dire de Lausanne à Liège, ou encore de *Port-Royal* à *Chateaubriant et son groupe littéraire*. Une quatrième et dernière partie, intitulée "le maître à penser du Second Empire" nous conduit jusqu'à la mort de l'écrivain.

L'oeuvre de Sainte-Beuve est aussi riche que diverse; l'existence du critique, bien qu'assez tranquille et pauvre en péripéties, n'en est pas moins fort complexe au point de vue biographique, en raison de ses contacts littéraires innombrables et de son rôle de premier plan dans la vie intellectuelle et sociale du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. L'étude conjointe de la vie et de l'oeuvre aurait donc du engendrer un texte touffu et sans relief. La nature de la collection n'était pas faite pour diminuer ce danger; *Connaissance des Lettres* vise à présenter, sous un format aussi réduit que possible, des synthèses assez complètes pour satisfaire les spécialistes eux-mêmes. Le but est fréquemment atteint mais il ne l'est, parfois, qu'au prix d'une certaine monotonie et d'un certain étouffement. Les caractères, toujours petits, et les paragraphes, souvent fort longs, contribuent à cette impression de manquer d'air que

nous donnent certains volumes. Il faut féliciter M. Regard d'avoir su éviter un péril auquel le sujet de son étude et la présentation choisie donnaient une urgence particulière. C'est un ouvrage aéré qu'il nous est donné de lire, aussi lisible et facile d'accès qu'il est savant et riche d'information.

Le livre se termine par une conclusion d'une dizaine de pages où s'établit le bilan littéraire et moral de Sainte-Beuve, dans un esprit de générosité qui n'exclut ni la nuance ni la prudence. M. Regard défend l'écrivain contre ses détracteurs; il n'hésite pas à parler de la "bonté" de Sainte-Beuve, mais il n'apporte pas à son plaidoyer la passion fougueuse et un peu aveugle de quelques prédécesseurs. C'est à l'égotisme qu'il faut ramener, nous dit M. Regard, les aspects les plus divers de l'oeuvre de Sainte-Beuve: même dans la critique, c'est toujours le *Moi* de Joseph Delorme qui s'éprouve et qui se cherche; c'est à ce *Moi* que s'adresse le blâme aussi bien que l'éloge. C'est donc lui-même que vise Sainte-Beuve, par l'intermédiaire de l'écrivain critiqué, dans les remarques les plus acerbes des *Lundis*; ce sont ses propres tendances que le critique dévoile et déplore en ses contemporains. Cette perspective fait de la critique littéraire une connaissance de soi-même qui apparaît à Sainte-Beuve — et à M. Regard — comme la vraie conquête de l'humanisme. L'ouvrage se termine sur l'évocation de Montaigne et c'est bien, en effet, à un fils spirituel de l'auteur des *Essais* que nous fait penser le Sainte-Beuve de M. Regard, à un fils qui demeure pourtant un peu plus sombre et un peu plus terne que son père.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

RENÉ GIRARD

**Marc Beigbeder, *Le Théâtre en France depuis la Libération* (Paris: Bordas, 1959. Pp. 258).** CAN one substantiate the theory that enduring drama is structurally unified but ambiguous, anguished yet serene, and that it rises stark from the hidden wells of men's collective conscience to take orientation in forward-looking historicity? Marc Beigbeder nimbly pursues this semi-Jungian, semi-Brechtian formula in *Le Théâtre en France depuis la Libération*, the most incisive and the most problematical of recent books interpreting French drama of the post-1944 years.

Beigbeder's panorama, although enlivened with challenging slants on recent theatrical evolutions in France, has attracted surprisingly

scant critical comment. Its implications, nevertheless, are novel and far-reaching. The core of this observer's theory concerning the contemporary French theater is his claim that "dramatic creation is evasion—but fused, circumscribed, historical evasion." By evasion, Beigbeder means something like poetic divination of present-day and future historical patterns, revealed in plays marked by revolutionary, specifically modern structures. (Despite surface similarities, his standpoint is not categorically Marxist.)

Logically, Beigbeder admits a preference for vanguard drama (e. g., the works of Jarry, Beckett, Genet, and Audiberti) to the detriment of traditional types. This favoritism is purposeful. His analyses repeatedly imply a basic appeal, which might be paraphrased, "The theater will either advance or stagnate. On French stages, conservatism has habitually brought stagnancy. We must transfigure worn-out, meaningless dramatic forms, or else watch our theater decay."

In discussing more than 320 significant plays performed in Paris since 1944, Beigbeder distinguishes two main approaches to theatrical art: what he terms "interiorizing" versus "exteriorizing" styles of writing and interpretation. (He of course admits the tenuousness of this dichotomy.) Introverted, ambiguous dramatic techniques are keynotes of truly modern, progressive theater, he asserts. On the other hand, drama suffused with overt, "unilinear" meanings goes against the modern grain and suggests a retrogressive, fruitless concept of theater. Upon this basis, Beigbeder assesses the contributions of influential playwrights and directors who have aided the cause of "interiorizing" drama in France: Jarry, Beckett, Adamov, the Sartre of *Huis-clos*, Copeau, Dullin, Georges Pitoëff, Roger Blin, and in less complete manner, Salacrou and Anouilh. Among "exteriorizing" creators, he studies Claudel, Mauriac, Aymé, Achard, Audiberti, Genet, and the *animateurs* Barrault, Michel Saint-Denis, Barsacq, Reybaz, Sarrazin, and Gignoux.

Beigbeder's credo of progressive historicity, central to his thesis, is extremely debatable and enlightening. Plays permeated with social traditionalism and "stylistic nostalgia" inevitably thwart the highest purpose of drama, true communal identification among performers and onlookers, he maintains. The dramas of Achard, Mauriac, Roussin and conservative boulevard authors are perverted by "arrested theatricality," since these works attempt to prolong outmoded sociological and dramatic conventions. Such plays, through their psychological assumptions, also tend to further an analytical viewpoint derived from

Cartesian methods tacitly accepted by most French spectators. This adherence to an old framework prevents all possible ambiguity in performance and critical interpretation; therefore, it stifles a genuinely modern aesthetics for the drama, according to Beigbeder. As a result of society's pressures, even some of the more anti-social playwrights like Anouilh and Salacrou compromise their originality by using traditional or eclectic structures in theatrical creation. Had they continued to develop unadulterated, new forms of their own, such dramatists might have achieved true communal fusion with audiences, by commitment to changing types of theater embodying modern contradictions of the past.

A signal quality of Beigbeder's insights is his fresh, precise appraisal of the recent "anti-drama" (à la Beckett, Ionesco, Adamov) and of little-known plays by younger French writers. Artistic antecedents are lucidly traced. Ionesco's purportedly revolutionary fantasies mingle neo-expressionistic tricks (chairs invade a room; time turns somersaults) with a patterned dialogue adapting the mathematical exactness of 1880-1910 farcical comedies in the Feydeau manner (the repeated series of rhythmic platitudes in *La Cantatrice chauve*) and enigmatic "interiorizing" hints (the teacher's impulsive violence in *La Leçon*).

"Mechanized theatricality," very often used by such directors as Jean Meyer, Jacques Fabbri, Georges Vitaly, and André Barsacq, is a modern offshoot of late nineteenth-century French *vaudeville* comedies, the stylistic liberations of surrealism, and Parisian cabarets' satirical skits. Beigbeder reviews the emergence of this intriguing tendency, which has evolved from Copeau's popularization of Commedia dell'Arte refinements and buffoonery through the intricate and polished styles of drama created by Jouvet, Baty, and their present disciples in France.

Also indebted to expressionism, at least in part, is contemporary "exteriorized or shouted theatricality." Jacques Audiberti, an audacious poet-playwright almost unknown on English-speaking stages, is the wildest French innovator in this genre. Extravagant verbal inventiveness, weird and sonorous melodic effects and fragmented characterizations typify his most striking plays (*Le Mal Court*, *La Hoberaute*). Somewhat comparable are the astonishing lyrical originalities of dramas by Pichette and Schehadé, richly poetic but too difficult for widespread acceptance. This expansive, "exteriorized" style has been exploited in lesser degrees by Cocteau, Adamov, and

at times by Sartre (*Le Diable et le Bon Dieu*), Genet (*Les Bonnes*), and Anouilh (*L'Alouette*).

Beigbeder gives the lion's share of credit for recent remodelings of French theatrical aesthetics and writing to Jean Vilar and his Théâtre National Populaire. A highlight of this book is the author's cogent appreciation of the T. N. P.'s amazing success with a public encompassing all the social classes in France. Vilar's sparse décors, his troupe's intellectual tautness in scenic renderings of rediscovered dramas aim first of all at an "interiorized" theatrical climate which suggests the contradictions and ambiguities of today's European spirit. Vilar, a fervent admirer of Brecht, comes closest to carrying out Beigbeder's ideal for drama with an evolving vision of history and art. The 1953 interpretation of Molière's *Dom Juan* by Vilar and his T. N. P. actors epitomized a crucial, modern reshaping of the theater's social and spiritual functions. Beigbeder views Vilar's sharply controversial delineation of Don Juan as a protagonist impelled by a "willfully degraded, mechanized, self-mocking interiorization." The T. N. P.-styled seducer, resembling modern man in his multivalent egoism, had "only one interlocutor: himself." Although outwardly speaking to other persons, in fact he was probing splinters of his own psyche. By portraying Don Juan as a contemporary libertine—"inflamed, double in nature, reflective"—Vilar intimately linked stage and history.

Beigbeder's concluding chapter, "Théâtre de Signification et de Communauté . . . Montherlant," is most quizzical of all. Montherlant's dramatic production, he asserts, stands as the "only work of nearly complete value [...] since the Liberation." To puzzled non-French readers, who may envisage Claudel, Sartre, Anouilh, and even Ionesco and Genet as complete dramatists, the author's riposte is clear but questionable. Only Montherlant's plays, says the critic, reawaken a deep and abiding sense of "community" by stirring the roots of an instinctively-felt, national theatrical heritage. By its unique but inherently French style, Montherlant's drama arouses the Gallic socio-artistic sensitivity to communal identification, not unlike that inspired by Racine's *Phèdre* or *Andromaque*.

A central paradox remains. Montherlant's twentieth-century dramatic lyricism and his artistic meanings, even though singularly appealing to today's cultivated French spectators, are in essence neo-classic rather than modern. The national awareness kindled by his masterpiece, *Port-Royal*, is exemplary of his equivocal genius, which



yearns for the spiritual grandeur of past eras and rejects the present, in what Beigbeder considers "anti-historical" drama.

Really important theater, says Beigbeder, must spurn retrogressive inclinations or sheer escapism. Moreover, it must fuse questioning of the concept of social strata, a masochistic, self-critical bent ("the sign and tone of historicity") of the kind found in plays by Pirandello, Claudel, Chekhov, Jarry, and a few works by Anouilh, and a dramatic structure which induces communal unity (the dramas of Montherlant, and to a slighter extent certain plays by Sartre, Beckett, Audiberti, and Ionesco).

The value of Beigbeder's book is arguable. Its style is labored, neologistic, and at times abstruse. The author's viewpoints toward recent French drama, while admittedly tendentious, are in the main incisive and illuminating. The appendix provides the best available summary of productions of important French and foreign plays given in Paris during the 1944-1958 seasons. There are numerous, evocative photographs of actual performances. The book's flaws and its excessive quantity of names of minor figures will not overshadow the merits of Beigbeder's controversial elucidations of new trends in the French drama, possibly the world's most diverse, most cosmopolitan, and most unpredictable.

*University of Michigan*

KENNETH S. WHITE

**John H. R. Polt, *The Writings of Eduardo Mallea* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1959. 132 pp. \$2.50. Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, 54).** LA obra de Mallea (nuestro gran novelista-Sísifo) sigue atrayendo estudiosos, lo que no es tan fácil de explicar como podría parecer a primera vista. Es obra reacia a la lectura continuada, debido al pensamiento tautológico y al lenguaje expresionista, escabrosidades de forma y fondo que rehuyen, hasta cierto punto, los métodos más frecuentados por la crítica. Frente a esto, en cambio, se yergue la indiscutible y admirable autenticidad del mensaje de Mallea. Argentino esencial, preocupado a fondo con la búsqueda y extracción de la raíz entrañable del valor y significado de su patria, Eduardo Mallea ha forjado con insistencia su obra toda en la revelación de la "Argentina invisible," según la denomina él mismo. Y es, precisamente, en la inefabilidad de este concepto que radican las grandezas y máculas de su obra.

El libro de Polt nos revela esto con rigor crítico — si bien en ocasiones parece trabajar en un vacío antiséptico, con un Mallea absoluto —, y a veces lo hace con una incisiva imparcialidad que demuestra que su autor no olvida la distancia que requiere el desempeño eficaz de la labor que se ha propuesto. A tal efecto la obra se divide en un breve capítulo introductorio donde se apuntan algunos datos sobre la vida de Mallea y la vida de la Argentina de esos mismos años. El capítulo II analiza "The Role of the Nation and the *Visible Argentina*," o sea el fraude vital y nacional que practica el hombre argentino que se aferra a las superficialidades. El capítulo III es "The *Invisible Argentina*," ese concepto vagaroso en el que Mallea asienta la realidad esencial de nuestro país. "The Role of the Individual" se titula el capítulo IV, y atiende al problema que se plantea Mallea de captar la eternidad (o intemporalidad) del significado nacional a través de la temporalidad de sus individuos componentes. El capítulo V, "Characters," repite y amplía lo expresado en el anterior, mientras que el VI y VII ("Structure," "Literary Style") se definen en el título. El libro se cierra con una breve "Conclusion," en la que, a pesar de su tono algo petulante, el autor pasa en clara y sucinta revista los méritos y defectos de Mallea.

Es lástima que Polt no nos haya dado un capítulo más de análisis de las características diferenciales de Mallea frente a sus coetáneos: un Borges por un lado, o un Martínez Estrada por el otro, verbigracia. En esta forma indirecta quizá se hubiera podido precisar algo más el esfumado contorno de su Argentina invisible. Al mismo tiempo, Mallea hubiera quedado enfrentado con la tradición, tema también soslayado por Polt, y espinoso, por cierto, en todo escritor, y más aún en Mallea, en quien es evidente que las "afinidades electivas" lo llevan por un lado, mientras que su postura vital lo asimila a la egregia lista de "preocupados" españoles.

Pero no estoy aquí para criticar lo inexistente. Hay mucho en lo que estoy de acuerdo con Polt, en especial con su apreciación de conjunto, y a menudo de detalle: por ejemplo, me causa satisfacción ver el puesto preferencial que da a *Todo verdor perecerá*. Mas debo agregar que no siempre he quedado satisfecho. Para ilustrar algo de esto último: se evidencia en muchas obras de Mallea un naturismo cuasi místico que no creo se deba explicar sólo en función de una antítesis conceptual *campo—ciudad*. Tampoco me satisface el énfasis casi exclusivo que se pone en el estilo indirecto en las novelas de Mallea (pp. 65-66), ya que con mucha frecuencia utiliza también el

estilo indirecto libre (*erlebte Rede*). Asimismo, al explicar el cuño del lenguaje metafórico del novelista (capítulo VII), iríamos todos más rápidamente al grano si partiésemos del concepto de Richter de lenguaje expresionista, que Polt no menciona en ningún momento.

En esto del lenguaje de Mallea hay una cuestión previa a las demás que Polt no plantea con la magnitud debida. En realidad, es cuestión que afecta por igual a todo escritor argentino (hispanoamericano), ya que en todos hay, en cierta medida, una aguda (¿enfermiza?) conciencia de lenguaje. Me refiero, claro está, al dilema entrañado en la proposición "lenguaje argentino *versus* español universal." Los planteos del problema en sus pasos intermedios son innúmeros, pero cualquiera de ellos, *velis nolis*, objetiva en forma dada la realidad argentina. La práctica de Mallea cae de lleno, desde luego, dentro de una apreciación no localista de dicha realidad, pero convendría hacer hincapié en el hecho de que a menudo se ha especificado lo argentino en lo opuesto. Y todo ello nos debería llevar a plantear con radical novedad la disyuntiva vital de vieja tradición literaria de ser argentino por vocación o serlo por afectación.

Mas para volver a la obra de Polt, y sus méritos efectivos, que los tiene. Es este un concienzudo análisis de lo que el propio crítico llama "Mallea's unsystematic and repetitious thought" (p. 4). A vuelta de ciertas repeticiones propias, este estudio nos aproxima más que otro alguno al meollo de la ideología de Mallea, y dada la conformación de ésta no es ello poca hazaña.<sup>1</sup>

The Ohio State University

JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE

**Herbert A. Frenzel, *Brandenburg-preussische Schlosstheater. Spielorte und Spielformen vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, 1959. Pp. 268. Schriften der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, 59).** THE present book deals with a topic which has been far too long neglected. We have had both specialised studies and general treatments of the various groups of wandering players of the 17th and 18th century. In the last decades the Jesuit drama and theater has become better known

<sup>1</sup> De las dos obras que Mallea publicó en el año 1957 (*Simbad, El gajo de enebro*), Polt conoce sólo la primera, y a pesar de que es su novela de mayor aliento, apenas si la usa, aunque como dice el propio crítico, no hubiera hecho más que corroborar muchas de sus aserciones (p. 107). La producción posterior a dicha fecha ya no cae dentro del marco de este estudio.

to us. Ever since Martersteig's meritorious handbook we have been well aware of the development of the 19th century city theaters. The court theater is in many ways a bridge between these various forms. And yet only a few specialised treatises have been dedicated to this material. Even the author of the present book wisely decided to postpone his original plans for a complete and exhaustive analysis of this phenomenon and limited his investigations to one particular area, that of Brandenburg-Prussia. Although in this way such important centers as for instance Vienna, Munich, and most of all Weimar could not be included, it seems to this reviewer that the material presented offers a fairly representative body for the entire development. The danger inherent in the topic is that for the earlier period when the sources are meager the treatment may become a useful, but dry catalogue of data and that when more ample evidence is available, it may get lost in insignificant details. Mr. Frenzel knows how to steer between these two extremes, and succeeds in giving us a lively, interesting, and highly informative picture of the various stages of the development.

A short general introduction recalls the baroque atmosphere when love for pomp and pageantry generated dramatic performances, when the extravagance in architectural experimentations turned improvised stages in court auditoriums into theaters, and when amateurish interests of individual court personalities developed semiprofessional organisations. The introduction closes with a quick glance at the few existing studies in the field.

The devastations of the Thirty Years' War delayed the full development of a courtly theater in Brandenburg-Prussia. Only in the second half of the 17th century can we speak of a first bloom. With the arrival in Berlin of Sophie Charlotte, daughter of the Kurfürst of Hanover and second wife of the Prussian Kurprinz (the later king Frederick I) her artistic interest quickly enriched court life. Opera and ballet; courtly dilettantism interspersed with hired professionals; ham, sausages and oxtongue; wine, lemonade and tea mark these rather exclusive affairs mostly conducted in Italian. Lützenburg — later called Charlottenburg in honor of this princess — and the various castles in and around Berlin set the stage for these fresh and probably rather unassuming undertakings. The architectural materials, carefully gathered from only fragmentary sources by Mr. Frenzel, give an interesting insight into the staging possibilities and techniques of the time.

The reign of the military Frederick William I signifies a decline of courtly theater life. With the ascendancy to the throne of Frederick the Great the second and highest climax in the development is reached. Indeed, an amazingly rich flow, already begun with the youthful activities of the Rheinsberg prince, continues up into the late days of the misanthropic old king. Again Frenzel's painstaking and resourceful work in reconstructing the numerous localities for the performances from often rather meager relics of documents and buildings together with the fine illustrations give an interesting insight into the staging of the time. The repertory, although mainly relying on Italian and French pieces, has gained in importance both in quality of selection and in variety of choice. And although the court is still very active in participation, professionalism is far more decisive. While the king is the focal point of the undertakings, his family, the high nobility of his state imitate his endeavors. In one of these smaller courts, that of the Markgraf Heinrich in Schwedt, the German program wins out over the foreign tongue. Here too the prevailing professional element marks the transition to the later development.

In the 19th century we feel that the court theaters more and more occupy a second place, have become an expensive luxury on the side of the now firmly established city theaters. They are no longer cultural centers, indeed they are sometimes hardly more than expression of personal quirks. Yet they still have a place for the cultivation of a theater in a foreign tongue.

Frenzel's book clearly demonstrates the importance of the court theater in the development of German cultural life. The art historian and even the sociologist may learn from it as well as the "Theaterwissenschaftler" and the "Germanist."

*The University of Texas*

WOLFGANG F. MICHAEL

**Margaret E. Atkinson, *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare*. A comparison of three plays with the original (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958. Pp. ix + 67. 8/6).** THIS study (of *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Julius Caesar*) considers "Content and Diction" (pp. 9-25), "Verbal Sound" (28-50), and "Schlegel and Later Translators" (51-67), coming to the conclusion that of all the attempts

made since Schlegel's day to improve on his version there is "not one, it would seem, to supersede his" (p. 51).

It is no doubt tempting, and I suppose that even at this late date it is legitimate, despite this favorable judgment, once more to make "an attempt to discover and examine the source and the nature of the discrepancy between Schlegel's version and the original" (p. 9). Such a scrutiny throws light on the problems and the procedure of all translating, especially in dealing with a poetic genius such as Shakespeare. I submit, however, that this critic's zeal, backed up by erudition, esthetic empathy, and acumen, has led her astray. She admits (p. 3), "Schlegel knew that [his] demands were not only exacting but conflicting and irreconcilable"; and again (p. 27), "his version does not sound like Shakespeare. And, indeed, it is impossible that it should." Nevertheless she insists on showing, at some length and in detail, that Schlegel did not achieve what she herself calls impossible, and what Schlegel in effect confessed he could not do. Surely this is beating a dead horse.

It seems to me neither legitimate nor profitable to find fault with Schlegel as translator for the fact that he lived two centuries later than his author ("we miss . . . the sense of being carried back to . . . a bygone day" — p. 12), for the limitations of the German language which was his medium (German does not have the consecutive strong accents which monosyllabic English readily affords; Schlegel's failure to use them is deplored on pp. 33 and 34), or for his success in bringing Shakespeare, without falsifying him, into the ranks of living German authors (his alterations "make the German 'Shakespeare' . . . more like an eighteenth-century poet" — p. 19).

If a critical study of Schlegel's translations is to serve a useful purpose, I think it must follow a very different line. Starting with the actualities of (Shakespeare's) English and (Schlegel's or modern) German, it should point to defects in the translation and propose improvements which are both possible and poetic in German. To criticize a translation is not difficult; to do better than a master like Schlegel approaches the impossible.

*Stanford, California*

BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN



Ernst Feise and Harry Steinhauer, eds., *German Literature since Goethe. Part One: The Liberal Age, 1830-1870; Part Two: An Age of Crisis, 1870-1950* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1958-59. Vol. I, viii + 408 pp. \$4.75; Vol. II, x + 395 pp. \$4.75). BECAUSE the task of writing an anthology of nineteenth and twentieth century German literature is so formidable Professors Feise and Steinhauer deserve both our gratitude and our admiration for their courageous undertaking. By exercising great care in the choice of their texts they have succeeded in composing an anthology which covers the entire period of German literature from Goethe's death to the present and which is neither one-sided nor superficial. In choosing their selections they have followed two main principles, including only works which possess both historical significance and literary value. The texts upon which they finally decided are both representative and of high literary quality. Wisely they have included not only belletristic texts, but also selections from important philosophers, social theorists, statesmen, and historians from which the reader can gain important insights into the main aspects of the political, social, and intellectual background of the period covered by the anthology.

In a work covering such an extensive time-span and which an undergraduate class is supposed to cover in two semesters, it was, of course, necessary to be quite restrictive. Of some important figures only token offerings are included; and others are represented only by one genre. In Volume I, for example, we find only the poetry of Heine; and of Georg Büchner the authors have included only *Der Hessische Landbote*. Mörike is represented only as a lyric poet; and from the works of Otto Ludwig we find only two brief, though excellently chosen pieces from the theoretical writings. In Volume II some readers may criticize the fact that narrative writing is represented to such a large extent by the essay. Others may wonder why the authors did not include one of the stories of Kafka. Some may even object that they have not quite lived up to the promise of their title, for the period after 1945 is represented only by a few poems. On the other hand, an anthology obviously cannot include everything; and, as we well know, the pieces omitted from Volume I and also the better known works of Mann, Kafka, Zuckmayer, Brecht, Borchert, Böll, and Dürrenmatt are easily available in inexpensive paper-bound editions.

An excellent feature of the anthology are the introductory essays. These contain all of the material normally included in introductory lectures, and by having the student read them outside of class the

instructor is free to devote all of the class time to discussing the texts. The footnotes, which are copious and which have been prepared with great care, also save time by supplying necessary background information and by glossing difficult expressions. Most useful, too, is the chronology of names and events at the end of each volume. By referring to these tables the student is able to see at a glance what was happening in Germany and elsewhere in the world in the domain of the *Geisteswissenschaften* at the time of emergence of a particular author, work, or movement in Germany.

The introductory essays and notes make it possible to use the anthology even with a second year reading class. For such groups the editors have prepared a general vocabulary which is available in a separate pamphlet at a nominal cost. At the Hopkins we used the book with great success in a course in which both advanced undergraduates and beginning graduate students were enrolled; and on the basis of our very favorable experience we recommend it without reservations for use in such classes. It would be difficult indeed to draw up a syllabus of readings which would offer the student a better overall view of German literature since Goethe's death.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

LIESELOTTE KURTH  
WILLIAM McCLAIN

**Ulrich K. Goldsmith, *Stefan George: A Study of his Early Work* (Boulder: Univ. of Colorado Press, 1959. vii + 172 pp. \$3.00. University of Colorado Studies; Series in Language and Literature, 7).** PROFESSOR Goldsmith's careful study of Stefan George's early work is a welcome addition in an area of scholarship that has certainly not been overworked during the past fifteen years. Outside of Boehringer's and Salin's biographical contributions, and one or two excellent attempts on the part of the German press to re-appraise the work of one of the most puzzling personalities of his time, there has been relatively little George-scholarship during this period. Unlike Rilke, George has been permitted, metaphorically speaking, to lie fallow—a not altogether detrimental penalty in view of the fact that a more just and rounded estimate is likely to emerge with the increasing time-span from the day the Meister was laid to rest, an exile in Minusio.

In his *Introduction* Goldsmith states quite clearly that the basis

for his systematic analysis is the conviction that George's 'will-to-power' is one of the principal motives underlying all his accomplishments. Today, in retrospect, there is little cause to dispute this hypothesis, and it would be both an interesting and challenging assignment to examine further into the 'role of power' (whether of Nietzschean derivation or not) which is so obviously implicit, if not explicit, in the work of modern poets other than George (Benn, Pound, even Rilke who has already been called the St. Francis of the will-to-power).

In six chapters (respectively *The Georgian Protest*, *Juvenilia*, *Travels*, *After France*, *The Search for a Companion*, and *The Evolution of a Doctrine and the Creation of a God*) the author reviews minutely and painstakingly the growth of a poet's mind, as it relates specifically to its simultaneous creations, from the early diffuse beginning through the crucial Maximin relationship. A study of the early poetry properly ends here (though, contrary to the case of most poets where 'early' usually means 'juvenile,' 'unripe' or even 'adolescent,' in George's case most readers would find within this time-span the very cream of his work).

With great sensitivity and patience Goldsmith unfolds step by step George's groping search for self and for the symbols of self-identification which was to lead him through many stages of painful uncertainty and defeat before final attainment. Such stages were the early isolation in youth, the sadistic-masochistic surrogates of the *Algabal* period, the failure in George's hierarchical thinking to come to terms with the normal sex-relationship (the Ida Koblenz episode) and, finally, the emergence of the male Eros leading to the Maximin god-reincarnation. Goldsmith scores time and again with valuable insights, such as the overstatement, on the part of the *Blätter* editors, for the Georgian influence in the early 'nineties, when it has been unequivocally established that the 'new' Symbolist poetry became known in Germany at that early date through writers and critics outside the George circle (pp. 12-13). Or, again, when George's alleged individualistic humanism is shown to be sharply contradictory to the anti-individualistic, non-humanistic aspect of his doctrine as the logical outcome of the subjection of the disciple's personality to that of the Master (p. 93). Quite rightly the author places the turning-point in George's career at the point of departure from the romantic idealism of Mallarmé towards a greater moral responsibility as a leader of youth.

Goldsmith's epigraph for his study (from *Der Stern des Bundes: Kommt wort vor tat kommt tat vor wort?*) is expanded in a brief *Conclusion*: "Stefan George reached far to establish before himself and before others the transcending authority which he needed, wresting it first from an angel that bore his own features, and receiving it finally as a gift from his own incarnate god. No matter how one may evaluate these experiences on which the poetic work of George feeds, his main urge was the desire to exert power over others, and this urge underlies even his early work" (p. 121).

At times the prosy literalness of much of the style leads to repetitiousness and seems out of keeping with the colorful dynamic personality the writer is dealing with, but the accuracy and careful sifting of evidence go far to make us forget such flaws. On the formal side, this study is thoroughly documented with footnotes and a most extensive and helpful bibliographical arrangement. The poem-specimens are everywhere faithfully translated into English in the text proper—with the originals in footnotes. One could only wish that a more convenient numeral-system had been devised to accommodate both the footnote-originals as well as the notes in the back of the text. As it is, the reader finds himself often staring at two sets of numbers of the same size and denomination. But these are minor matters, and the reader ends up cherishing the hope that Professor Goldsmith will see fit, within the near future, to carry his interpretations further into the poetry of the later George.

University of Minnesota

FRANK WOOD

## **Image and Meaning**

**Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry**

**DON C. ALLEN**

**\$4.00**

"This extremely scholarly and beautifully styled work examines 8 widely known Elizabethan works." *Library Journal*

## **Pope's Epistle to Bathurst**

**A Critical Reading with an Edition of the Manuscripts**

**EARL WASSERMAN**

**\$7.50**

An immensely valuable analysis for students of the 18th century relating Pope to the stream of English literary, ethical and religious tradition.

## **Apollo and the Nine**

**A History of the Ode**

**CAROL MADDISON**

**\$6.50**

"An excellent and meticulous study of the classical origins and Renaissance developments of a literary form peculiarly enduring in Western literature." *Library Journal*

## **André Malraux**

**The Conquest of Dread**

**GERDA BLUMENTHAL**

**\$4.00**

"Valuable in understanding the significance of Malraux's work." *Library Journal*

order from your bookstore or

**The Johns Hopkins Press  
Baltimore 18, Maryland**